

Ronald E. Hall

An Historical Analysis of Skin Color Discrimination in America

Victimism Among
Victim Group Populations

 Springer

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

An Historical Analysis of Skin Color Discrimination in America

Ronald E. Hall

An Historical Analysis of Skin Color Discrimination in America

Victimism Among Victim Group Populations

Ronald E. Hall
Michigan State University
School of Social Work
254 Baker Hall
East Lansing MI 48824
USA
hallr@msu.edu

ISBN 978-1-4419-5504-3 e-ISBN 978-1-4419-5505-0
DOI 10.1007/978-1-4419-5505-0
Springer New York Dordrecht Heidelberg London

Library of Congress Control Number: 2009941475

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2010

All rights reserved. This work may not be translated or copied in whole or in part without the written permission of the publisher (Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, 233 Spring Street, New York, NY 10013, USA), except for brief excerpts in connection with reviews or scholarly analysis. Use in connection with any form of information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed is forbidden.

The use in this publication of trade names, trademarks, service marks, and similar terms, even if they are not identified as such, is not to be taken as an expression of opinion as to whether or not they are subject to proprietary rights.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

*Doers of Diversity: Theodore Curry, Ph.D.,
Associate Provost/Vice President, Associate Vice
President of Academic Human Resources
Paulette Granberry Russell, J.D., Senior Advisor
to the President for Diversity and Director, Office
for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives*

Preface

In the aftermath of the Atlantic slave trade and European colonization, white Americans discriminated against persons of African descent as a matter of cultural tradition. The various manifestations of such discrimination, based upon racial category, are referred to as racism. In the aftermath of colonial domination and racism, discrimination as a social pathology evolved into a tradition among the oppressed as well as their oppressors. That is, racist traditions directed at people of color including those of African descent were acted out by people of color themselves as a consequence of pervasive, universal acts of racism and discrimination to which they were subjected. Various manifestations, such as discrimination among people of color, while not racist per se have been referred to as “colorism.” As a consequence of discrimination, colorism practiced by people of color and other victim-group populations evolved throughout history commensurate with white racism. Thus, while less apparent in the twenty-first century, white racism prevails in the acts of discrimination engaged by victim-group populations. Their years of racist subjugation have fashioned a psychic response no less given to the pathological transgressions of their oppressors. Subsequently, in this new era, people of color have resorted to discrimination against other victim-group populations, which have been no less inclined to discriminate as well. The common medium for both at a time when race has become increasingly less relevant is skin color. Discrimination by skin color among victim-group populations is referred to as victimism.

Victimism is an extension of white racism, acted out by victim groups including people of color (African-American, Asian-American, Latino-American, and Native American), biracial Americans, gay and lesbian Americans (and, to a lesser extent, the transgender community), women, and immigrants. Much like colorism, victimism is a manner of discrimination, based on skin color, without respect to the demographic status of the perpetrator. It is historically rooted in the colonial traditions of white supremacy. In a society that has evolved to unprecedented racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity victimism, while historically existent, is the newest version of racism in the twenty-first century.

To undertake a treatise on racism in the twenty-first century is to wade into an area fraught with hegemony and Eurocentric bias. In fact, victimism as a twenty-first century version of racism has existed since the colonial antebellum and perhaps long before. Unfortunately, academia and other societal institutions, which archive the

social universe of human existence, have been the eminent domain of white intellectuals. Their version of social reality could not accommodate or indeed acknowledge any behavioral phenomenon beyond the mainstream white perspective. This inability is Eurocentrism (meaning focusing on Europe and its culture, defined herein as a Western worldview of the human, universal, and social environment), whereby any previous discussion of victimism would have been tantamount to inviting visceral accusations of blasphemy from the assumed objectivity of respected academics. Succinctly put, as an extension of white supremacy, any intellectual product of social scientific investigations must be validated by the mainstream academy or it is doomed to be considered nonexistent. Thus, while victimism has imposed upon victim-group populations in America, historically Eurocentrism has prevented its introduction into the discourse of mainstream academe. Academe both past and present thus remains an extension of the antebellum, not irrelevant to cultural traditions associated with white supremacy. In the aftermath, social reality as it pertains to discrimination amounts to little more than contrived conclusions of the intellectual status quo. Those who elect to challenge the ideas of that status quo, regardless of race or victim-group status, are then subjected to ridicule and destined for academic obscurity. Thus, despite the fact that discrimination in the twenty-first century is a multiracial, multiethnic, or otherwise multifaceted phenomenon, the intellectual status quo remains committed to the black/white racial dichotomy and its Eurocentric version of discrimination. Subsequently, it is my opinion that acknowledgment of discrimination by victimism is the most challenging task for the evolution of social science investigation. However, continued failure to acknowledge discrimination among victim-group populations merely because it is beyond the realities of a Eurocentric intelligentsia is likely to contribute to the digression of scientific investigation as a whole. Such digression will enable the continuation of a racial myth that all those who discriminate are white and that all those who suffer are black.

Despite the Eurocentric myopia of an academic status quo, throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, African-American and Latino-American scholars investigated and documented skin color discrimination as it pertains to victimism. While seldom acknowledged in text of the mainstream academy, such discrimination held that, among people of color, there were discriminatory distinctions based on skin color. Because of skin color litigation, such as *Felix v. Marquez* and *Morrow v. the IRS*, blacks and Latinos engaged in lively and frequent discussions regarding the significance and implications of victimism. We spoke in terms of a lighter-skinned upper class and a darker-skinned but expanding lower class, similar to the more widely acknowledged white racism. Notwithstanding litigation, this manifestation of discrimination in the current era remains beyond the domain of mainstream academe. Social work scholars in particular, both black and white, dedicated to racial diversity in human services have been negligent. By way of Eurocentrism, women of color especially are suffering increased rates of skin cancer, still births, and suicides relative to skin color discrimination; suffering unnecessarily because victimism is irrelevant to quality of life among white women. As a result, social work texts and journals, including those committed to women's

issues, have treated such victim-group pathologies as little more than social trivia and/or nonexistent.

In 2008, America elected its first African-American president, Barack Obama. President Obama received overwhelming support from the black community, but his election would not have been possible without the support of conscientious white Americans and other people of color. No less than a few decades prior, President Obama would have been breaking the law by a mere attempt to register to vote. His desire to become president of the United States would have been remote to the extent of being beyond the realm of fantasy. The fact that today a black man is leader of what remains the world's foremost superpower is representative of a new era in the investigation, analysis, and interpretation of a social reality that is no longer the domain of a Eurocentric status quo.

Despite the election of a black president, discrimination in America is a potent and formidable social pathology, both at present and in the foreseeable future. However, the Eurocentric models of social science research are no longer, and perhaps never were, relevant to legitimate scientific investigation. Just as America has begun to cross racial boundaries by electing a black president, the intellectual status quo of academe, both black and white, must free itself of racist cultural traditions and submit to the supremacy of ideas over the supremacy of race. It has an investment in the purity of scientific research, such that eugenic conclusions motivated by aftermath of colonization and the Atlantic slave trade should never again pose as scientific fact. Thus, pertaining to the academy of social work and other human service professions, theoretical priority and its account of social reality should not be contingent upon the preferences of social work and other scholars, but should consider what is the most urgent imposition upon the well-being of humanity—without respect to Eurocentric ideals. Such a change will require recognition of works for their scholarly worth rather than popularity or institutional affiliations. This change will require that the status quo intelligentsia resort to the spirit of debate and disciplined investigation in their incorporation and/or acknowledgment of ideas pertaining to discrimination and other aspects of social reality. They must then move beyond the trappings of a mainstream orientation in hopes of rescuing science from the bigotries of Eurocentric hypocrisy. I intend to accommodate this change with the introduction of skin color issues into the mainstream of modern social science investigation. Doing so will bring forth newer, more applicable models of discrimination and social reality that extend to a variety of human existential circumstances. The results will ultimately free academe from the tyranny of Eurocentric conjecture and align the state of scientific investigation with the momentous election of a black president in the United States.

East Lansing, Michigan
23 April 2009

Ronald E. Hall

Acknowledgments

Hosts of the 2006 Symposium, Colorism: Global Perspectives on How Skin Color Still Matters:

Dr. Emilie Smith, Professor and Director, Center for Family Research in Diverse Contexts, The Pennsylvania State University; Dr. Linda Burton, Professor, Duke University (former Director, Center for Family Research in Diverse Contexts, The Pennsylvania State University); Dr. Chalandra M. Bryant, Associate Professor of Human Development and Family Studies; Dr. Lori Francis, Assistant Professor, Biobehavioral Health, The Pennsylvania State; Dr. Sherri Lawson Clark, Assistant Professor, Wake Forest University (former Research Associate at The Pennsylvania University).

Symposium Speakers

Dr. Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, Duke University; Dr. Barbara W. Farmer, Principal Marita Golden, Author; Dr. Christina Gomez, Northeastern Illinois University; Dr. Ronald E. Hall, Michigan State University; Dr. Cedric Herring, University of Illinois, Chicago; and Dr. Edward Telles, University of California, Los Angeles.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Colonization as the Origin of Western Discrimination	11
3	Racism: The Original “ism” of American Discrimination	23
4	African-Americans: The Idealization of Light Skin	37
5	Asian-Americans: The Historical Implications of Light Skin	57
6	Latino-Americans: Skin Color and Mixed-Race People	71
7	Native Americans: Manifestations of White Influences	91
8	Biracial Americans: The Advantages of White Blood	109
9	Gay and Lesbian Americans: Oppression by the Oppressed	127
10	Women: Better White than Male	145
11	Immigrants: The Desire to Be White	167
12	Conclusion: Diversity in the Future	183
	Index	201

Chapter 1

Introduction

Historically, variations in skin color enabled human racial categories, which consequently facilitated victim-group discrimination [1]. Scholars differ as to the number and implications of skin color for the various race categories, but included are Negroid, Caucasoid, and Mongoloid, which represent every ethnic and national variety of human. The first or “original” man, as far as archaeologists are able to determine, was a member of the Negroid race [2]. Negroids are indigenous to Africa and characterized by dark skin, course hair texture, and broad noses. In contrast to the Negroid, Caucasoids and Mongoloids are characterized by skin color and features: They are lighter-skinned and broadly located throughout the world. In Western terminology, Negroids and Mongoloids are referred to as “people of color,” distinguishing them from Caucasoids, who lack skin color.

In the opinion of biologists and medical professionals, race is scientifically meaningless [3]. By referencing various English dictionaries, this alone would define race as a myth. Scientists motivated by an earnest drive for research contend that valid facts are one form of knowledge and myths are another. Facts should be the results of rigorous scientific methods, which seek truth without the imposition of ulterior motives. Myths, on the other hand, have no methods to which the scientific investigator must adhere. The distinction between fact and myth is unnecessary, given that myth is less valued for being factual as truth is not the objective. Although the earnest investigator will note the ambiguities existent in so-called rigorous scientific findings, the investigator will also acknowledge the human limits of scientific objectivity conducted by well-intended human beings.

Indeed, not every scientist pursued the myth of race based on skin color with disregard for scientific methods. Some were quite fervent in their attempts to establish truth. Unfortunately, such scientists were limited by their exposure to untruths about racial constructs, which assured the eventuality of racist conclusions, despite efforts to conduct research independent of such. Ultimately, for different reasons, the efforts of “objective” scientists validated race as a true “fact,” attaching its significance to the prestige of Western institutions. Hence, by the time Western civilization had gained imperial powers, the euphemistic groupings of man were differentiated as biological fact based on skin color and validated by the influences of Western science. A Negroid was referred to as “black,” that is, African-American (dark skin);

the Caucasoid was referred to as “white,” that is, Euro-American (light skin); and the Mongoloid as “yellow,” that is, Asian-American (light skin or dark skin). The Latino-American designation was in fact a combination of mixed races, described in skin color terms as “brown.” The various designations of color do not necessarily pertain to the skin of each group literally, but instead served as metaphor extended from race rhetoric. These variations in skin color have been dramatically played out in the all too often colonial confrontation between dark- and light-skinned race groups [4]. In the aftermath of such confrontation is the enablement of white racism and victim-group discrimination for Western colonial purposes.

People of color as a victim group have not readily acknowledged their role in the perpetuation of discrimination. The failure of victim-group populations in general to comprehend their role in Western racism rests on the West’s dark/light skin dichotomy. Prior to the denigration of dark skin, historical skin color differentiations were first alluded to by ancient Greeks. The Greeks referenced dark skin, to which, however, classical authors had not yet attached any basic significance. “Ethiopians do not astonish Greeks because of their blackness and their different appearance,” Agatharchides wrote [5]. It was apparent to him that such a fear is a childhood *tabula rasa* or the mind at birth without preconceptions. Agatharchides’ statement was not only an accurate assessment of the ancient Greek’s reaction to dark skin, but it resonates today as an aspect of childhood known to psychologists. “Four-year olds,” according to Gordon Allport, are in fact quite interested, curious, and appreciative of differences in racial groups [5]. Furthermore, Alan Marsh, in considering the awareness of racial differences in African children living in modern-day Britain, finds that the critical age of racial curiosity seems to be around three to three and a half years [5]. Thus, it would be perfectly normal for a Western child living in a predominantly Western environment to take notice of darker-skinned Africans. Simply put, children may be aware of differences implied by skin color, but will not necessarily attach judgments to them as was true of the ancient Greeks. This is especially true as it pertains to the pattern of racial discrimination, unless they are exposed to socializing forces that emphasize overt racial identification and overt acts of racial hostility. To illustrate the point, Marsh notes that “such socialization forces were absent. . . overt race values, beyond those affective bonds formed in personal relationships, were also absent in children” [5]. Thus, ancient Greek children lived similarly in an environment where dark-skinned persons frequented, but where overt discrimination and racism toward them was not a fact of life. Once they attained adulthood, Greek children had no reason to attach significance to differences in skin color or to think those of African descent were in any way fundamentally different or inferior.

In the annals of Western civilization, documentation of the attitudes toward dark skin suggests racism was lacking. Greek references, however, are informative, particularly when they are scrutinized within the context of beauty. By virtue of historical record, it is possible to examine the early Greek norms for beauty and their implications for dark-skinned people. The combined Platonic, Lucretian, and Ovidian assumptions of the classical norm image suggest a distaste for extremes. The main characters in classical Greek poetry seem to prefer their own skin color to that of the extremely light-skinned Germans or the dark-skinned Africans [5]. The

Greeks used themselves as the ideal in their expressions of aesthetic preference. Little mention is made, however, that there were Europeans as well as Africans who did not meet the Greek norm image. This omission allows for a negative emphasis on dark skin that distorts the original view of Africans today.

In other sectors of early Western civilization, there were those who extolled the beauty of dark skin and did not hesitate to do so publicly. Herodotus, the first known among Westerners to express an opinion about the physical appearance of Africans, describes them [Ethiopians] as the “most handsome of all men” [5]. Others, such as Philodemus, put their feelings about dark skin into poetry. In reference to a certain Philanion (short, black, with hair more curled than parsley and skin tender than down), Philodemus concludes as follows: “May I love such a Philanion, golden Cypris, until I find another more perfect” [5]. Additionally, Asclepiades praises the beauty of the dark-skinned Didyme: “Gazing at her beauty I melt like wax before the fire. And if she is black, what difference to me? So are coals when we light them, they shine like rose-buds” [5]. Theocritus contends that those who refer to his Bombyca as sunburned should know that to him she is “honey-brown and charming and adds that violets and hyacinths dark but are the first flowers chosen for nosegays” [5].

The otherwise benign implications of skin color evolved to imply psychological meaning. Among a majority of victim-group populations, irrespective of Westernization, there then exist narcissistic ideals of physical beauty. In referring to such ideals, Harry Hoetink [6] uses the concept of “somatic norm image,” which he defines as “the complex of physical somatic characteristics accepted as ideal” [5]. Hence, all groups consider themselves aesthetically superior to all others. As an illustration of the concept, Philostratus remarked that Indians esteemed white less than black because, he implied, black was the color of Indians [5]. Greek orator Dio Chrysostom’s [5] discourse on beauty put forth the question as to whether there was not a foreign type of beauty just as there was a Hellenic type. Finally, Sextus Empiricus [5] noted that men differed in definitions of beauty, contending that Africans preferred the blackest and most flat-nosed; Persians, the whitest and most hooked-nose. Thus, as it pertains to the eventuality of victim-group discrimination, a Western somatic norm implies the belief that superiority is physiologically based in the Western racial and skin-color categories. Any deviations from a category are presumed to be inferior, enabling various social and political objectives to be acted out by victimism. Accordingly, the following are implications of victimism for victim-group populations: (a) somatic ideals including skin color are continually rooted in Western Eurocentric ideals, although it is seldom articulated in polite circles; (b) by virtue of colonization and white supremacy, such norms are inculcated by people of color among victim groups as their native ideal; and (c) the effort of victim groups to aspire ideally then necessitated their manifestation of the supremacist ideal, despite implications for victim-group self-preservation.

By idealizing the supremacist notions of light skin, the denigration of dark skin, being a vehicle of racism, is a psychological by-product of projection, first mentioned by Sigmund Freud in his utilization of psychoanalysis. The objective of projection is the changing of the psychological situation by the subject to suit the

subject. Projection is a critical component of the Western supremacist repertoire. It is used daily by Americans in reference to certain ideas and behaviors. If a particular behavior appears to be projection to an outsider, in retrospect it could never be recognized by the subject, who would perceive a completely different phenomenon. Thus, long before benign ancient Greek contacts with Africans, there existed the potential to project onto dark skin by assigning derogatory meanings to the term “black.” Among the more notable are “Deeply stained with dirt; soiled, dirty, foul. . . . Having dark or deadly purposes, malignant; pertaining to or involving death, deadly; baneful, disastrous, sinister. . . . Foul, iniquitous, atrocious, horrible, wicked. . . . indicating disgrace, censure, liability to punishment” [7]. Any form or human feeling associated with blackness suggested something bad or evil. Even today, that association connotes little difference between badness and its alliance with blackness.

The symbolism of blackness has played a critical role in determining racist perceptions of dark-skinned people, according to a considerable segment of the Western population [7]. In the mind of the most typical Western citizen, the color black symbolizes lust, sin, evil, dirt, feces, death, and so forth. When they first encountered Africans via the Atlantic slave trade, Europeans projected these derogatory connotations onto Africans, correlated to some extent with the intensity of dark skin. Yet in other Western societies including ancient Greece, blackness might find favor. Similarly, modern scholars will note, for example, the positive regard for blackness in Western music. But the positive regard for black musicians hardly rescues blackness as a vehicle in the denigration of dark skin, which merely suggests an attitude less intense than either the “dominative” or the “aversive” positions identified by Joel Kovel [4].

Some of the common terms for dark skin, which on the surface appear harmless but are associated with its denigration, are sable, dusky, and ebony. Few, if any, scholars would suggest that any such terms connote evil, feces, or death. But it is only on the surface that such terms avoid negative connotations. If it is suggested that these terms dismiss assumptions of negativity by their relative sterility—what psychologists refer to as a reaction formation against an underlying disgust—then, in fact, the argument for Western disgust relative to dark skin is made. Negative regard for blackness makes the point while positive regard proves the point, too, since positive regard in the West is clearly motivated by repressed feelings of negativity.

Yet white is not necessarily positive. White, too, can symbolize death or evil in Western psychology just as easily as can black, for example in sickness or as in Death’s horse being traditionally pale [8]. In brief, Western culture has customarily accepted a “black” positive and negative as well as a “white” one. The symbolic meaning of black versus white has thus never been simply equivalent to bad versus good. However, psychologically, blackness enables projection without limitation, as when children or adults imagine things in the dark. This would suggest that blackness might be more potent than whiteness (light skin) could ever be. If true, the Western psyche would have been much more amenable by domination to the denigration of dark-skinned peoples despite the fact that people of color had been

rendered less threatening having been conquered and colonized by those who were light-skinned. What is more, the act of projection will occur if and only if the projector has developed some need to engage it. Europeans arguably projected onto Africans to justify the slave trade. Typical victim groups have no such history with dark-skinned people. The question must then be answered as to why they need to have an obsession with the denigration of dark-skinned people, if not motivated by submission to colonial domination and Western imperialism. Subsequent to universal tolerance, the enslavement of dark-skinned people gained wide acceptance that culminated in America's antebellum Civil War South.

While skin color was all but benign during the ancient Greek era, today's persons of European descent are distinguished among the world's population by a lack of skin color. According to Frances Cress Welsing [9] and Michael Bradley [10], in a world populated by people of color, this lack of skin color had a psychological impact that facilitated Europe's colonial aggression. That aggression enabled Europeans to dominate the world, militarily, economically, and ultimately psychologically. As people lacking color, persons of European descent were motivated to conquer, extended from a feeling of color inadequacy. Thus, the threat of dark-skinned people existed only in the Western mind, attributed to peoples having the most color—Africans or African-Americans. In an effort to calm psychological threats and justify the Atlantic slave trade, it was then necessary for the West to project onto dark-skinned African peoples that which it could not reconcile morally. This would buffer their psyche from a history of atrocities requiring the worldwide export and institutionalization of white supremacy, to which victim groups eventually submitted as psychological progeny.

Psychological progeny, as acted out by victim-group populations, implies the ability of one group to impose its ideals upon another absent consideration for the latter's reaction [11]. Regardless of particular methods used, dominant groups may then idealize the social universe. Furthermore, aside from the more obvious aggressive tactics, true dominance may derive from influential behavior and relative status. In the West, dominant-group Euro-Americans are then in a position to psychologically incorporate people of color and other victim-group populations, who have been stigmatized as alien, to their somatic norm [12]. Euro-Americans as individuals may incorporate victim-group populations without making conscious or overt decisions to do so. The willingness of these populations to acquiesce is sustained by Western imperialism. Regarding the dynamics of the scenario, research suggests dominant-group Euro-Americans acquire power directly by emphasizing competence and action. Dominated victim groups acquire power by virtue of identification with and/or submission to dominant-group ideals, for example, the marriage of conservative Republican Senator Phil Gramm to Asian-American Wendy Lee Gramm [13]. Given the status differential between these dark- and light-skinned spouses, resulting interactions between group members are thus tantamount to the acceptance of victim-group discrimination.

The current status of the West as a global superpower and its psychological impact upon non-Europeans have resulted in a willingness of victim groups

to discriminate by skin color. For those who might otherwise be regarded as victims of racism, unlike the ancients, their domination by the forces of Western imperialism has made them no less amenable to the denigration of dark-skinned (African-descended) peoples. Being the psychological progeny of Western imperialism, Eurocentric language, bloodlines, and ideals became symbols of status among victim-group populations. Furthermore, the ability of the West to affect a racial skin color hierarchy was no less ingenious than traditional colonization in having an impact upon the victim-group psyche. A system of stratification that eventually overlapped with skin color and/or race can be summarized as follows: The West found a way to maintain power over victim groups psychologically via racial criteria. Relative to racial criteria, many people of color did not arrive in the West being racist, but maintained by culture a strict sense of superiority and a tendency to rank the world's various peoples accordingly. Once exposed to Western racism, where African-Americans were the objects of racist projections, people of color and other victim groups submitted to discrimination against Blacks rather than risk becoming objects of racist projection themselves, thus reinforcing racist notions of hierarchy and white superiority convinced that this would enable their own assimilation into the American mainstream. The penchant for hierarchy became a marital strategy, with Wendy Gramm as an ideal, and which spawned an international business in mail-order brides. In other words, the indigenous mores of non-European people had given way to the racist influences of Western domination. That is not to say that racism per se is typical of people of color, but their psyche in particular has not withstood the assault of Western imperial forces.

Psychological-progeny discrimination among victim-group populations is no longer a question of its existence, but rather of its function in sustaining "white" supremacy via worldwide domination. While people of color, including African-Americans, are not racist in the traditional sense, they are facilitative in their racist denigration of dark-skinned people. A focus upon the dynamics of skin color will enable social scientists to broaden the concept of racism that will eventually free all people from discrimination and psychological domination. That is not to suggest all peoples are the progeny of Western imperialism or that all Euro-Americans are unified in maintaining world domination. However, among those of various skin colors, who make earnest attempts to eliminate racism, their numbers are far too few. They struggle daily against racist agendas because the success of their efforts would result in a dramatic shift in worldwide wealth and power. Immediate eradication of racism would liberate oppressed and vulnerable populations at the expense of Western imperials, which Peggy McIntosh [14] refers to as "white privilege."

In order to comprehend the historical extent of victim-group discrimination in America, it is necessary to understand that the dynamic of every major institution operates on the basis that some degree of discrimination is acceptable; if not rhetorically acceptable, it is at least expected and considered unavoidable. For example, the educational system uncritically accepts that victim-race students should have a markedly lower score on standardized tests. The norms of an institution are, in effect, its standards for achievement; they are the expectations that tell an individual what is required. When one starts challenging norms or aspiring beyond a designated role, one is punished or denied opportunity by the power structure. Such is

the case for many of the South's best and brightest African-American minds—like Martin Luther King Jr.—who must relocate to Northern institutions to realize their educational potential.

Volumes of literature have been written pertaining to discrimination against victims by race, skin color, and other criteria to explain the circumstances of their oppression. Beginning in the early 1800s, theories prevailed that labeled various factions of mankind as inferior. In this more modern era, the inferiority theory has been sanitized to suggest that they are inferior due to their economic and social conditions or because they do not have the intellectual capacity to compete in an advanced technological society [15]. Thus, in the minds of many Americans, whether the reason is biological or intellectual, discrimination facilitates accusations of racial inferiority as a fact of life.

During the 1960s, Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan wrote about the pathology of dark-skinned African-Americans and suggested special programs to better their situation [16]. For decades, the US government funded special programs to assist African-Americans, which conservatives denounced as wasteful spending. Today, they rationalize the pseudoscience of Richard Herrnstein—who contends that African-Americans are intellectually inferior—and others as evidence of the waste [17]. The common assumption has been if African-Americans fail to gain admittance into college, obtain gainful employment, or locate housing, then it must be the result of some personal inadequacy enhanced by liberal policies. Occasionally, when presented with an overwhelming amount of evidence in exceptional cases, conservatives will concede that a racist landlord or a bigoted employer is at fault. However, few will admit there are less comprehensible societal ills built into the very fiber of this nation, given the more overt acts of discrimination recorded in both distant and recent history [7].

Victim-race groups including people of color have been the focus of Western oppression directed by white racists. This is true whether they are indigenous or they immigrate or become US citizens. In 1881, the Supreme Court declared Native Americans to be “alien.” Shortly thereafter, both Asian and Mexican Americans were discriminated against by American institutions to varying degrees: The Asian Exclusion Act of 1889 denied Asian immigrants the right to enter the country; the assignment of Japanese citizens to relocation centers during WWII was unprecedented. Mexican Americans were denied the right to attend so-called public schools during the 1880s because the schools served predominantly white students. These four examples illustrate the involvement of government and educational institutions in the perpetration of discrimination under which victims have internalized as a norm. Thus, for members of victim groups, their American experience has taken the form of overt and covert discriminatory acts, no less significant psychologically. Despite the fact that victim groups have experienced suffering under such oppression, often of their own efforts, they appear no less given to practices that may ultimately impair their future and quality of life.

Given the existence of discrimination at every level of American society, what prevails is then no longer an accusation associated with the Euro-American mainstream. Discrimination by various acts has become so socially diffused that it is

now an essential element of the mediating process, through which many of the basic rewards for the entirety of society are granted. In other words, the mechanisms for oppressing victims of discrimination have become so complex and intricate that it is practically impossible to reverse the process. The crux of discrimination necessarily extends from a black/white dichotomy that is arguably no longer as relevant in a multiracial society.

What is attempted herein, in the first study of its kind, will be an analysis of the latter, acknowledging the discriminatory role played by those who are normally designated as victims [7]. While it is no doubt a political risk to cite victims or to stray from the mainstream perpetrator model, avoidance to do so in an emerging multiracial world would be tantamount to self-defeat.

Regardless of politics, discrimination in America has arguably prevailed as one of its most devastating and tenacious social ills. Extensive literature and research have added little to facilitate discrimination's demise. Contributing to ignorance is the fact that for decades, discrimination has been portrayed as a Euro-American phenomenon, a psychosocial behavioral event directed at people of color—particularly darker-skinned African-Americans [18]. There should be no doubt about the accuracy of this assumption. Notwithstanding, to characterize discrimination in such a narrow context does a disservice to the scientific method. It enables the otherwise absurd rhetoric of hierarchy to play only within a single race group and, in fact, provides a conduit for the continued social, economic, and political domination of victims. However deserving of sympathy it is, analyzing the role of victims when examining discrimination is an issue that must be acknowledged. For victim-race groups—relative to Euro-Americans—race then acknowledges their status as minorities. Their skin color is their most potent and salient feature because it contrasts with that of the American mainstream. Because it is relative, skin color allows for the manifestation of discrimination—both between and among each group. Dark skin may affect every phase of life, including mate selection, general stereotyping, and treatment by the judicial system. Dark skin is a “master status,” which differentiates victim-group people of color as an inferior element of the population. So potent is this master status that it has recently served as grounds for discrimination litigation between persons of light and dark skin color who belong to the same racial or ethnic group [19]. Resorting to legal tactics is an indication that, for some, discrimination has been particularly painful, given the psychologically conflicting implications of dark skin. That is, people of color have idealized much of American discrimination, but unlike members of Euro-American ethnic groups, they have been prohibited from full assimilation into society. Their willingness to idealize discriminatory norms regardless reflects a desire not to devalue themselves but to improve their quality of life and live the American Dream. In so doing, victims of discrimination harbor disdain for dark-skinned people and other victim groups because such disdain is an aspect of the American status quo [20]. They recognize that dark skin is regarded as an obstacle by various institutions that might otherwise afford them the opportunities necessary to succeed. For victims who aspire to success, oblivious to this, failure is frequently the end result. Furthermore, since quality

of life has demonstrably correlated closely with mainstream norms, discrimination has emerged as a critical factor in one's ability to enhance opportunity [20].

While the dual role of victim and perpetrator as played by the oppressed is noteworthy, their participation as victims up to the current point in time seems more urgent. Individual- and group-level discrimination establishes and sanctions discrimination ubiquitously. The involvement of the government in housing is an obvious illustration of how it can happen. By sanctioning unequal treatment, the housing institution sanctioned inequality in status between those who are victims of discrimination by various levels of status. For example, when the US government decided to grant FHA loans to residents of nonintegrated areas only and to finance the movement of Euro-Americans to the suburbs instead of rebuilding the inner cities, discrimination was actually perpetuated by way of unequal goals, objectives, and priorities for people of color. By making it impossible for darker-skinned people to move from the city and to have access to more and better jobs, the government also assisted in the discriminatory effort to reduce people of color in status. It further suggested policies to keep out "inharmonious racial groups" [21]. As a result, American suburbs today border the inner cities that are dominated by people of color. As more people crowd into these overpopulated areas, conditions reach the crisis stage. Furthermore, while living in substandard and overcrowded housing, other economic and social inconveniences exist, which are less obvious, having implications for victim-group discrimination.

As folk who value knowledge, social scientists have agonized over the manner in which the victims of discrimination accommodate nationwide discrimination. On more than one occasion, they have encountered members of victim groups, who are then trained to challenge the keenest aspects of discrimination with hardly any consideration given to the social and cultural gaps perpetuated by the discriminatory acts attributed to their own people. In fact, most social activists have gone through their entire activist experience with not a word mentioned about it. It should therefore come as no surprise that victims of discrimination have not understood the role of their own discrimination in the demise of oppressed victim-group populations. For many reasons, the topic in practically every sector of society has remained an unspeakable taboo. Most would agree that this is dangerous. It serves the tenets of discrimination and the mainstream status quo. In the aftermath, people of color and all other victims of discrimination define their worth in association with the discrimination of the mainstream population. Rather than belittle the discrimination engaged by victim-group populations as trivial compared to that of whites, science will be best served by its deliberate and methodical investigation of social phenomena, independent of potential political outcomes.

References

1. Hirschman, C., & Kraly, E. (1990). Racial and ethnic inequality in the United States, 1940 and 1950: the impact of geographic location and human capital. *International Migration Review*, 24(1), 4–33.

2. Rogers, J. (1967). *Sex and race*. St. Petersburg, FL: Rogers.
3. Kitano, H. (1997). *Race relations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
4. Kovel, J. (1984). *White discrimination: a psychohistory*. New York: Columbia University Press.
5. Snowden, F. (1983). *Before color prejudice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
6. Hoetink, H. (1967). *The two variants in Caribbean race relations: A contribution to the sociology of segmented societies*. (E. M. Hookykaas, Trans.) London: Oxford University Press.
7. Richards, G. (1997). *Race, racism, and psychology*. New York: Rutledge.
8. Pieterse, J. (1992). *White on black*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
9. Welsing, F. (1970). *The Cress theory of color confrontation and racism*. Washington, DC: C-R Publishers.
10. Bradley, M. (1978). *The iceman inheritance*. Toronto: Dorset.
11. Hall, R. E. (Winter, 1995/1996). Dark skin and the cultural ideal of masculinity. *Journal of African American Men*, 1(3), 37–62.
12. Chan, C. (1987). Asian America women: psychological responses to sexual exploitation and cultural stereotypes. *Asian American Psychological Association Journal*, 12(1), 11–15.
13. Hedley, M. (1994). The presentation of gendered conflict in popular movies: affective stereotypes, cultural sentiments, and men's motivation. *Sex Roles*, 31, 721–740.
14. McIntosh, P. (Winter, 1989). White privilege: unpacking the invisible knapsack. *Independent School*, 90(49), 2.
15. Smith, M., Beaulieu, L., & Seraphine, A. (1995). Social capital, place of residence, and college attendance. *Rural Sociology*, 60(3), 363–380.
16. Smith, E. (1987). The black family: Daniel Patrick Moynihan and the tangle of pathology revisited. *Humbolt Journal of Social Relations*, 14(1–2), 281–305.
17. Herrnstein, R., & Murray, C. (1994). *The bell curve*. New York: Free Press.
18. Hernton, C. (1964). *Sex and racism in America*. New York: Grove.
19. *Morrow v. the Internal Revenue Service*, 742 F. Supp. 670 (N.D. Ga. 1990).
20. Hertel, B., & Hughes, M. (1988). The significance of color remains. *Social Forces*, 68, 1105–1120.
21. Hall, R. (1997). Eurogamy among Asian Americans: a note on western assimilation. *Social Science Journal*, 34(3), 403–404

Chapter 2

Colonization as the Origin of Western Discrimination

Modern-day discrimination, acted out by victim groups in America, is an extension of Europe's historical colonial era. The act of European colonization is defined as the peopling of foreign territory—usually Third World—previously settled by a native population, with emigration from the mother country [1]. Since the existence of the Western Roman Empire, European colonial powers including Spain, England, and Portugal have dealt with their Third World subjects (people of color) in one of three ways: eradication, exclusion, or assimilation [1]. Ironically, it is the assimilation experience of people of color and other victim populations that has psychologically inspired their tendency to discrimination in the aftermath of colonization.

Western (European) colonization and dominant US influences at various locations around the world have long since ended. Unfortunately, the subjugation suffered by victim-group populations during colonization has not been resolved. Most of the previously colonized nations are now proud, independent sovereignties, but the psychological effects of their colonization remain. The Western obsession, including that of America, with skin color is ever visited upon the victim psyche. It is evident among victim populations as psychological colonization, in which the victims of the colonial era act out various forms of discrimination against other equally subjugated or victimized populations themselves. One manifestation of victim-group discrimination is the apparent preference for colonial mates as a spousal ideal. While spousal preference may be less brutal than traditional overt colonization, psychologically it is identical to discrimination in the way that it demeans victim-group populations.

Indicative of the colonial psyche, dominant-group Europeans—being light-skinned—are easily differentiated from dark-skinned populations, hence the convenience of their denigration. This response facilitates the subjugation and control of dark-skinned men, who pose the greatest threat to overcome the subjugated status of victim groups, thus the focus of the need for their colonial control [2]. That control has resulted in their being ultimately denigrated and discriminated against in Western courts, prisons, education, and all other quality-of-life institutions [3]. In the genetic makeup of dark-skinned men is a strong, color-producing material—melanin. Melanin is biologically dominant and something the light-skinned, Western male cannot manufacture at the cellular level. At the same time, Western males value melanin for its association with power and

masculinity; they also despise melanin for their inability to produce it. The Western colonial fear—particularly among males—is that should the producers of this material not be subjugated and subjected to colonial control, status may be lost and they may have a limited future in offspring [4].

Among Western women, the colonial implications of dark skin are manifested differently, but for the same basic reasons. Their personal disposition is a textbook lesson in colonial psychological domination. At one end of the spectrum is the light-skinned, sexless virgin who is so preoccupied with the cultural dictates of chastity that her sexual needs are limited by dysfunctions. At the other end is the fallen vamp whose reputation for having given in to what makes her a woman is forever banished from the fold of being a respectable lady. In an effort to endure her pain, the vamp may delve totally into the world of dark-skinned men. She can know no mediation between the Western mainstream and the dark-skinned community, which is a function of the colonial stigma applied to interracial marriage, especially between black men and white women [5].

Western colonial implications of dark skin are germane to the colonial status hierarchy among victim-group Americans. Harry Kitano implied that colonization is an extension of human cultural stratification and is based upon a system that consists of a dominant light-skinned Western and dominated dark-skinned non-Western populous [6]. It is the contention of Max Weber that societies are divided between those who rule and those who are ruled and that dominant groups tend to draw lines around themselves in order to control the quality and consistency of interaction between the subjects of their denigration and themselves [7]. They exhibit a tendency toward closed systems and the ordering of people into hierarchies based on proximity to dominant-group prerequisites more often than not on the basis of the most obvious skin color. Victim-group populations, because of their skin color, were generally placed near the bottom of the Western colonial hierarchy [8]. As immigrants migrating from non-English speaking countries, most could not speak the language very well; they were less familiar with American culture and sometimes lacked the necessary resources to succeed. Furthermore, many had not the education and/or competitive skills required for rapid mobility; unlike those of European descent, their dark skin was alien to the American mainstream. The permanent subjugation of these groups was a psychological vehicle to the internalization of discrimination norms relevant to assimilation and ultimately to the preferred quality of life.

Peculiar to the modern era is the manifestation of discrimination by and among victim-group populations exposed to centuries of white colonial domination. Unlike that of Europeans, the victim version of discrimination is more often psychological in nature. To understand the impact of victim-group discrimination requires an examination of both European and the equally dominant American influences. Both factors played a role in the creation of a discriminatory hierarchy that victim populations initially found objectionable but later practiced as an extension of preferred Western norms. Thus, according to Anthony Powell, it should not come as a shock that an unusually large number of African-American soldiers, in objection to colonial dynamics, deserted the armed forces while serving in the

Philippines; many then joined the Filipino struggle for independence [9]. Despite such noble efforts, the result is a hierarchy ever so subtle, but nonetheless existent among colonized victim groups at home and abroad. In every country colonized and/or dominated by Western forces, a similar hierarchy exists under similar circumstances, including Cuba, Brazil, Panama, Jamaica, Japan, and Puerto Rico. In fact, Cuba is regarded by some such as Carlos Moore—a dark-skinned native of Cuba—as the most discriminating society in the Hispanic Caribbean. The physical, social, and cultural mores that the European Spaniards exported were thus shaped and modified to effectively sustain aboriginal populations under a system of psychological colonization. The beneficiary of course was Spain. The success of this system in the Philippines was largely dependent upon the experience of the first generation of locals to be colonized [2]. Although their lives and those of later Filipinos were directly impacted, mixed-race Filipinos in particular, in association with dark-skinned and light-skinned Filipinos, would continue manifestations of colonization, reflected in their Western migration and human social interaction patterns.

The ability of victim populations to act out discrimination during social interaction depends principally upon somatic visibility, attested to by Hoetink's somatic norm image and the assumed superiority of Western colonials. However, the mere belief in superiority is not enough to sustain the phenomenon. Mechanisms that were less likely to exist among ancients must be constructed to stigmatize and reinforce differentiation. Included are (a) the use of stereotypes, which leads to avoidance; (b) the use of legal barriers and norms, which leads to a competitive disadvantage; and (c) isolation of the previously colonized group [5]. How colonials are treated by their colonizer is a function of any perceived threats, unpopularity, and the enforcement power of the colonizing entity. Frequently, the eruption of a crisis rationalizes extreme actions that may even include extermination. In the aftermath, exiles, refugees, and various acts of cultural genocide prevail. The more excessive actions tend to occur when prejudice, discrimination, and segregation have exacted their toll to the extent of becoming idealized norms. As a consequence of these idealized norms, victim-group populations who settle in Western countries may idealize colonial somatic ideals without conscious recognition of their existence. The act may indeed conflict with the sensitivities of their moral convictions because race-based social interactions are difficult to psychologically justify. Whereas Europeans may be differentiated by socially selected cultural traits, in the West, victim populations—including people of color—are distinguished by socially selected physical traits, for example, dark skin [10]. Designation by cultural group traits would have little or no meaning absent colonization. Hence, in Western countries including the United States, the classification of people of color as alien is dependent on the perceptions and definitions held by members of the mainstream population in cooperation with their racial subjects. Whereas some Europeans, such as Italians, did not initially fit the Western ideal, they were not differentiated as permanently alien via the skin color norm. They do not regard themselves as subjugated nor are they so regarded by the dominant-group mainstream [10].

Among the largest number of victim-group populations in the United States resulting from colonial domination, dark skin is germane to their somatic makeup.

It presupposes interpretation in the West as a peculiar phenomenon extended across both historical era and geographical location. In the West, no other somatic trait so essentially defines non-Western, victim-group identity as does dark skin. Conversely, the role of a self-defined identity is compulsory to the emotional and psychological health of a people confronted by the challenges of historical colonization. However, as with classic literature, Charles Cooley likens much of psychological well-being stemming from identity to the “Looking Glass Self” [11]. The Looking Glass Self is a metaphor that characterizes identity as a reflection of the self in public perception. From that perception, the core of identity is fashioned. A similar analysis has been proposed by G. H. Mead, who contends that identity is a product of social interaction [12]. The process is complete once the host has moved from the “I” to the “me” perception of self. Complimenting the work of Mead, Wade Nobles and W. Cross extend the concepts of “I” and “me” to group memberships [13,14]. According to Nobles, group membership bestows a “weness” to the identity development process. Finally, Erik Erikson contends that identity is not static [15]. Vis-à-vis physiological characteristics, it evolves out of a complex of decision-making experiences. Exemplifying the traditional, Erikson later wrote that final identity is fixed “at the end of adolescence” [15]. Identity pathology as evolution of colonial experience is well demonstrated in an analysis of victim groups who discriminate. Their discrimination is an attempt to realize a “weness” by which they are psychologically merged with the dominant, mainstream population even at the risk of their own psychological well-being.

Given the critical dynamics of identity, once members of colonial victim-group populations migrate to Western countries, they engage in a process of self-denial relevant to skin color. As a result, they may develop their identities around a racist self-concept as reflected in the bleaching of hair, alteration of eye folds, and other cosmetic modifications. An intense self-hatred then produces feelings of inferiority, making for a paternalistic attitude toward the Western mainstream. They mimic behaviors assumed to be necessary as a means of escape from the victim-group population, which ultimately is beyond the realm of possibility. Their efforts are evident in documented research that confirms their ascribing “badness” to dark colors and “goodness” to light, seeing dark objects as smaller than they actually are and seeing light objects as larger, plus other powerful positive/negative color evaluations. Thus, people of color as colonized victim-group populations, having relative darker skin, act out self-hate in a variety of discriminatory life choices. When opportunities are consistently made available on the basis of skin color, those who have darker skin experience despair, regardless of race. For some victims of discrimination, such discrimination against others serves a critical psychological function attributed to the historical influences of dominant-group oppression.

Consequent to Western ideals, people of color as a subjugated victim population with some exception intermarry and bear biracial offspring specifically for purposes of escaping a despised self. Biracial offspring as a separate entity comprise a group with which most Americans may have had little or no experience because, until recently, they did not identify themselves as a separate population entity. Although the literature acknowledges the existence of a biracial population, there

has been minimal discussion of the significant differences and similarities indicative of mixed-race Americans and how these differences and similarities might impact the identity of victim populations and their potential for discrimination. Instead, discussions regarding psychologically colonized, biracial Americans tend to incorporate them into separate or mainstream groups on the basis of skin color and other racial criteria. In the aftermath, social scientists might ask as follows: How are biracial people of color diverse and in what ways are they similar? Second, what are the implications for culturally and racially diverse populations to be perceived as members of an alien group based upon skin color and other racial attributes?

In the backdrop of these queries, colonized people of color as a victim-group population pose formidable challenges to social scientists. The size of this group is increasing rapidly, and indicators such as dating and marital patterns in the western area of the United States suggest the need for more comprehensive study of those located particularly in the United States. In California, the state government in the 2000 census has made available a group category separate from traditional race to accommodate mixed-race populations [16]. Hitherto, the Federal Census Bureau has yet collected data summarizing this population. Consequent to criticisms from an increasingly vocal biracial population, federal agencies have begun to modify standards for collecting race and ethnic data. However, such information remains unavailable for public consumption. Fortunately, a few states—including California—having a significant biracial population have acted with deliberate speed to acknowledge its racial diversity.

In California, a Eurasian Filipino—that is, biracial—is defined as one descended from more than one racial category [16]. The fact that interaction among people of color is more likely between colonial elements and people of color than between people of color suggests biracial is more often than not colonial in nature. However, because maternal/paternal race data are organized by mono-racial criteria, it is impossible to report the racial status of parents. Thus, the number of Eurasian births reported in the same data may be biased downward. Conversely, since the racial status of children in the California data are derived rather than self-identified, there may be an overestimated number of Eurasian births. Thus, in the aftermath of historical colonization, California today has one of the United States' most diverse populations in the country. While legal barriers to intermarriage were abandoned relatively early compared to other states, this has otherwise enabled little more than a moderate increase in Eurasian births within a 15-year period. However, taken as a percentage of state data as a whole, biracial births—including Eurasian births—rose from just under 12% in 1982 to just over 14% in 1997. In real numbers, this increase accounts for about 50,000 births in 1982 and about 70,000 in 1997 [16]. The most dramatic aspect of such births is the fact that differential rates involve Eurocentric women to men of color. More often than not, couplings consist of white men married to Asian women of color, as colonial dictates would prescribe.

Despite modest rates of increase, the number of Eurasian births in California is significant and substantial. In fact, biracial births exceeded Asian mono-racial births for the state of California in 1997 [16]. The increasing size of this population provides a context for understanding the concerns raised by Eurasian groups

regarding identity. Further concerns pertain to the implications of psychological colonization relative to biracial births and the potential for victim-group discrimination. As such, when asked to identify themselves by traditional race categories, Eurasians are more often resentful or confused. Those who resent are more inclined to discriminate against victim populations if they are not educated about the relevant dynamics. All too frequently, racial criteria have been utilized to categorize the more resentful as Caucasian, being those who may subsequently experience what George Meade and others would regard as serious identity conflict [17]. As a result, it is necessary to consult with individual Eurasians regarding their identity and how they define it. Questions must be sensitive to the possibility that such persons may have experienced a dramatic change in social status attributable to a system of race-based identification. That is, culturally they may be more rooted in the Euro-American community, but skin tone would cause them to be considered a person of color. Successive change can impact their psychological well-being, self-esteem, interactions with others, and assimilation prospects, which encourage victim-group discrimination as a norm into adult life.

In the historical aftermath of colonization, victim groups including biracial Americans encounter today a much more industrialized Western culture. Some who manage entry into the upper classes are familiar with Western discriminatory norms. Enabled by education and less threatening circumstances, post-World War victim groups—especially if they are light-skinned—are spared the violence and overt hostility endured by previous generations. However, their unique features and out-group status have remained alien to the Western gene pool and mark them as permanently ineligible for all but marginal acceptance into society absent some alliance with the colonial mainstream [18]. The alternative experience, by the biracial in particular, is assumed to facilitate quality of life should they conform to the influences of psychological colonization.

Psychological colonization of victim groups facilitates modern-day victim-group discrimination because it implies the ability of postcolonial groups to impose their ideals without resorting to overt strategies or violence [18]. Regardless of the particular methods used, postcolonial groups may then construct a social universe extended from self-prescriptions, which—in the case of biracial Americans—is not always perceived as pathological. Furthermore, aside from the more obvious aggressive tactics, psychological colonization may also derive from assimilation and an inspiration to reach the desired quality of life. In the West, dominant-group Europeans have not been inclined to negotiate more civil norms to accommodate their color opposites [18]. Individual Euro-Americans, who labor under the influences of colonization as well, cannot bring themselves to confront the fact of their oppression. They respond instead as if such oppression is a remote abstraction and, while it exists, is rare and not attributable to them personally. The willingness of their subjects to discriminate against their own is rooted in their forefathers having been colonized, first overtly and then covertly. Colonized victim groups who perceive reaching a self-appreciation by alien norms are psychologically reinforced, thus necessitating discrimination under all too often amenable circumstances [19].

Among victim-group populations who discriminate, psychological colonization is enabled by Eurocentrism, a postcolonial paradigm that has impacted the thinking of international scholars regarding various subject matters [20]. This otherwise obvious assumption is not subject to dispute in the least. Academia and other colonial-influenced intellectual institutions are no doubt a recapitulation of a colonial world order, which has been dominated by a Western geopolitical entity since Europe's colonial imperialism. What is more, as part of a geopolitical entity, "knowledge" pertaining to what is and is not discrimination extends largely from Europe [21]. Thus, until 1945, social science was centralized in the West, including France, Great Britain, Germany, Italy, and the United States. Furthermore, despite the emergence of non-European or victim populations, the generation of knowledge remains given to the ideas and ideals of a limited perspective [22]. As a result, non-European populations and accounts of discrimination are portrayed in European colonial contexts that are all but irrelevant to victim-group existence. Thus, as a matter of logic, victim-group discrimination has been trivialized regarding race. This trivialization has distorted the perception of by whom and how discrimination is enacted. In order to accommodate an increasingly diverse era, the generation of "knowledge" must bend to facilitate emerging trends in population shifts. The inability to do so will encourage accusations of elitism from the very groups it proposes to serve [23]. The unforeseen implication of this elitism is that "knowledge" will convert to something colonial in both shape and substance and will then lend itself increasingly to the auspices and/or influences of myopic Eurocentric standards [24]. In an effort to succeed, the potential of humanity will accordingly fall prey to the pressures of colonial forces. Re-thinking the dynamics of discrimination extending to victim-group populations is a beginning effort to rescue "knowledge" by validating challenges to the current status quo.

Eurocentrists who determine the implications of discrimination have facilitated the canonization of racial discrimination without engaging conclusive debate or empirical analysis of various other forms. A loosely organized conspiracy would be polemic and would demean scientific methods. Their hegemony is neither justifiable nor ethical, but is a pseudoscientific colonial collaboration designed to standardize the existential reality of human life. In the aftermath, the significance of victim-group discrimination would be all but dismissed from what is existentially real. The inability to conform to the Eurocentric perception of discrimination is a casualty of the hegemony that has standardized colonial norms to date. Such an inductive method undermines democracy and discourages the intellectual rigor, which could provide new solutions to world problems. In a postcolonial era vastly more diverse than in the past, uncontested consequences will court disaster.

Eurocentric scholars have advocated recently for diversity and the uplifting of oppressed populations [25]. However, their advocacy has not been consistent in conceding the role of victim group status in the analysis of pathological social norms. In rhetoric, they concede the significance of victim groups, but are for the most part ill equipped to fully grasp its dynamics. This shortcoming is devastating because it is the hegemonic, Eurocentric, colonial element that drives the manufacture of "knowledge." Scholars of color who excel do so by espousing Eurocentric rhetoric

[26]. Those who do not excel are labeled as radicals and ultimately banished to the fold of intellectual obscurity. Their banishment serves the status quo, preventing discussions of discrimination or any social phenomena not validated by the Eurocentric elite. These elitists are formidable in that they are the gatekeepers of admission to programs at the best universities. They manage publication of the best textbooks and peer-reviewed journals by which the dissemination of knowledge is conveyed. Thus, those who would profess the significance of scholarship acquiesce, with some reservation, to the dogma of race discrimination until such time that empirical investigation can determine they are wrong. They endorse race and are willing to accept the hypothesis that best fits existing evidence.

The inability of Eurocentrists to concede the colonial influence upon knowledge suggests their hegemony does not rise to the level of consciousness [27]. Conversely, non-European victim groups are astutely aware of that influence [28]. The result is a psychological colonization that has rendered knowledge all but totally irrelevant to the issues confronting non-European populations. Extended from psychological colonization is then unnecessary ignorance. Ignorance of victim populations is measured by individual effort, which allows Eurocentrists to sustain themselves despite their intellectual transgressions.

With respect to psychological colonization, there are several reasons why scholars should consider the incorporation of alternatives to race discrimination. First, the significance of discrimination is well known and if skillfully addressed, it will likely enable worldwide study of victim and other populations [29]. Second, discussions of discrimination for most conjure images of legal conflicts with the potential to charge emotions; when it is associated with stereotype, it encourages knee-jerk condemnation of an entire people, their social structure, lifestyle, and other aspects of their being [30]. The traditional substatus surrounding victim groups will impair their ability to thrive in a Eurocentric, postcolonial environment, unless the more rational prevail. Third, discrimination must be viewed in proportion to its consequence in the lives of both victim and mainstream populations. To do otherwise will accommodate Eurocentrism, rendering knowledge a less accurate portrayal of people and the “facts” conveyed about them.

Beyond racial constructs, the most efficient means of compromising psychological colonization is to become more amenable to a universal perspective. Education pertaining to the relevance/irrelevance of race will enable that effort [31]. Scholars who are so enabled will then be in a better position to study and accurately portray discrimination by and among victim-group populations. Equally important is the impact of education upon the world at large. An advantage of education includes the ability of scholars to create tolerant environments by the building of bridges beyond what is politically necessary. The focus on such bridges to victim populations should be their language, history, cultures, colonial influences, and so forth, rather than the assumptions associated solely with their race.

Following the turn of a new millennium, the ability to accurately perceive, conceptualize, and study victim-group discrimination is necessary in our rapidly changing and complex world. Upon entering a new millennium, scholarship must be the starting point for the rescue of non-European populations from the standards

of colonial norms. Hence, scholars are obligated to a higher benchmark of “fact” establishment and moral excellence. Their ability to purge humanity as a whole can be accomplished by expanding group discrimination beyond the construct of race to include skin color, religion, politics, gender, and other aspects that are equally significant. In order to accomplish such a feat and enhance knowledge, and reduce the threats of ignorance, scholars and other concerned citizens must additionally concede the ecological fact that all groups have assets, capacities, and strengths as well as weaknesses. Since many of these are derived from colonial legacies, particularly among people of color, all must considerably increase their information base. Furthermore, as more contacts occur between world populations, scholars are confronted by discrimination issues and perspectives that have not required consideration in the past [32]. They are thus challenged in future research to develop creative constructs less confined to Eurocentric and/or colonial traditions. That consideration must remain consistent and viable without interruption to sustain the emerging world order.

Therefore, the psychological colonization of victim populations exceeds mere political subject matter that is passively reflected in Western postcolonial culture, scholarship, and institutions. It is not representative and expressive of some overt nefarious Western plot to subjugate people of color. It is, rather, the manufacture of geopolitical awareness via the West as the dominant somatic ideal [19]. Psychological colonization is an elaboration not only of a basic somatic distinction but also of a series of assumptions by such means as scholarly endeavor, philosophical construction, and psychological analysis. It not only creates but also maintains the present postcolonial world order. It is, above all, a discourse that is, by no means, indirect. It maintains a corresponding relationship with political forces, which ultimately drives Western civilization. It manifests as psychological colonization in an uneven exchange with various kinds of power, shaped to an effective degree by political, intellectual, cultural, and idealized criteria that are ultimately relevant to victim-group discrimination today.

Finally, aside from colonization, discrimination assumed less often perpetrated by victim groups is not extraneous to their ecological reality [33]. Their role in the perpetuation of discrimination must be acknowledged, including the decoding of Eurocentric concepts, illumination of hegemonic inequalities, and other moves to intellectual discourse. Through the prescripts of struggle, their efforts have not been without precedent but, in fact, endure as a continuum wedded to the larger blueprint of knowledge. Scholars, Eurocentrists included, must then become cognizant of their unique role: that of advocating for more accurate population facts [34]. Enabled by the study of victim-group discrimination, these scholars will contribute to an effort to purge colonial influence from the American intellectual ethos. The outcome will nurture the evolution of knowledge, despite the implications of psychological colonization among victim-group Americans; that having not occurred sustains racism in the modern era as the next most significant dynamic in the perpetuation of victim-group discrimination.

References

1. Kitano, H. (1997). *Race relations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
2. Pratt, J. (1950). *America's colonial experiment*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
3. Ngozi, B. (1997). The US organization, Maulana Karenga, and conflict with the Black Panther party: A critique of sectarian influences on historical discourse. *Journal of Black Studies*, 28(2), 157–170.
4. McPhail, M. (1996). Race and sex in black and white: Essence and ideology in the Spike Lee discourse. *Howard Journal of Communications*, 7(2), 127–138.
5. Kitano, H. (1985). *Race relations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
6. Weber, M. (1946). *From Max Weber: essays in sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
7. Mazumdar, S. (1989). Racist response to racism: the Aryan myth and south Asians in the US. *South Asia Bulletin*, 9(1), 47–55.
8. Buwalda-Macatangay, M. (1998). Filipinas in Europe get ready for year 2000. *Philippines International Review*, 1(2).
9. Gilchrist, M. (1985). The Philippines annexation debate: As contained in four selected speeches. Michigan State University: 109285THS.
10. Hyde, C. (1995). The meanings of whiteness. *Qualitative Sociology*, 18(1), 87–95.
11. Cooley, C. (1902). *Human nature and the social order*. New York: Schreiber.
12. Mead, G. (1934). *Mind, self, and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
13. Nobles, W. (1973). Psychological research and the black self-concept: a critical review. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1970, 26, 69–86.
14. Cross, W. (1987). A two-factor theory of black identity: implications for the study of identity development in minority children. In J. S. Phinney and M. J. Rotheram (Eds.) *Children's ethnic socialization, pluralism, and development*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
15. Erickson, E. (1968). *Identity, youth, and crisis*. New York: Norton.
16. Tafoya, S. (2000). Mixed race and ethnicity in California. *California Counts, Population Trends and Profiles*, 1(2), 1–12.
17. Mills, J., Daly, J., & Longmore, A. (1995). A note on family acceptance involving interracial friendships and romantic relationships. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 129, 349–351.
18. Hall, R. E. (1994). The Bleaching Syndrome: light skin, psychic conflict and the domination model of western assimilation. *Indian Journal of Social Work*, 55(3), 405–418.
19. Hoetink, H. (1967). *The two variants in Caribbean race relations: A contribution to the sociology of segmented societies*. (E. M. Hookykaas, Trans.) London, Oxford University Press.
20. Stinson, A. (1979). Community development in an era of paradigm search. *Social Development Issues*, 3(3), 6–21.
21. Hagen, J. (1982). Whatever happened to 43 Elizabeth I, c.2? *Social Service Review*, 56(1), 108–119.
22. Joyner, C. (1978). The historical status of American Indians under international law. *Indian Historian*, 11(4), 30–36, 63.
23. Tambor, M. (1979). The social worker as worker: a union perspective. *Administration in Social Work*, 3(3), 289–300.
24. Park, S., & Green, C. (2000). Is transracial adoption in the best interest of ethnic minority children?: questions concerning legal and scientific interpretations of a child's best interests. *Adoption Quarterly*, 3(4), 5–34.
25. Brown, C. (1995). Empowerment in social work education with older women. *Social Work*, 40(3), 358–364.
26. Bell, E. (1991). Adults' perception of male garment styles. *Clothing and Textile Research Journal*, 10(1), 8–12.
27. Corbett, M. (1995). The relationship between white racial identity and narcissism. Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B-The Sciences and Engineering, 56(4B), 2318.

28. Gitterman, A. (1991). *Handbook of social work education with vulnerable populations*. New York: Columbia University Press.
29. Hurdle, D. (2002). Native Hawaiian traditional healing: culturally based interventions for social work practice. *Social Work*, 47(2), 183–192.
30. Bridges, G., & Steen, S. (1998). Racial disparities in official assessments of offenders: attributional stereotypes as mediating mechanisms. *American Sociological Review*, 63(4), 554–570.
31. Hall, R. (1992). Bias among African Americans regarding skin color: implications for social work practice, *Research on Social Work Practice*, 2(4), 479–486.
32. Harvey, R. (1995). The issue of skin color in psychotherapy with African Americans. *Families in Society*, 76(1), 3–10.
33. Hall, R. (2001). *Filipina eurogamy: skin color as a vehicle of psychological colonization*. Manila, Philippines: Giraffe Books.
34. Barnes, S. (2001). Stressors and strengths: a theoretical and practical examination of nuclear, single-parent, and augmented African American families. *Families in Society* 82, 449–460.

Chapter 3

Racism: The Original “ism” of American Discrimination

The implications of psychological colonization visited upon victim-group populations provided the cultural foundation for increasing the potency of existent racism. Although a distant era in history, Americans—including people of color—continue to manifest the impact of Western colonization in their social interaction preferences. As a product of racism, discrimination attributed to victim-group populations begins with the existential circumstances of Third World countries, which in most instances are now freed from the yoke of European sovereignties. What prevails in the Third World and its worldwide population is sustained today through cultural influences that have been manifested by overt and covert acts of racism. Regarding skin color, such racism is aimed primarily at black males or similarly dark-skinned men, given that black males are the polar opposite extreme of the prevailing white-male power structure in a country given to patriarchy traditions. The racist outcomes of their encounters are measurable by any number of quality-of-life indicators. As a result, racism relative to victim-group discrimination is the original “ism” of the various manifestations. For instance, any 15-year-old white female residing in the state of Michigan has a 92% chance of living to the age of 65. In the same state, a 15-year-old black male will have less than a 60% chance of living to age 65. There remain health-care professionals everywhere who are impacted by racism; they are committed to providing for the best health interests of their fellow man and do so with reactions to skin color, while hardly acknowledging any reference at all to the implications of racism as a reason for the existent health-care disparities. Undoubtedly, statistical differentiations do not explain the obvious health disparities between groups, but the history of overt acts of discrimination suffered by black males is cause to suspect an association. Similarly, conservative politicians who are especially dominated by racial ideology have failed the nation in their near denial that racism still exists, as many are convinced that it is simply a relic of the distant past. When astute politicians attempt to acknowledge racism in some fashion, they are unfairly criticized for fanning the flames of racial tension. Furthermore, many who teach at some of our most prestigious universities, which serve a substantial black male population, haven’t the faintest idea of how the implications of racism have facilitated acts of discrimination by victim-group populations and have universally overlooked the consequences of their victimization.

As scholars and historians are well aware, racial category continues to serve the dictates of racism locally and has helped sustain an international social pathology, with American influence. Frequently, African-Americans are confronted with incidents of racism, which society at large is reluctant to acknowledge, in an effort to consider a matter to have been resolved. The fact that racism prevails in our modern era is a blemish upon the national façade, which few among the mainstream are willing to confront for fear of its personal impact upon them. For this reason and others, racism has remained an unspeakable taboo in practically every sector of the academy, politics, community, and society at large. This inability to confront such an insidious pathology is the means by which it is sustained in the behavior of victim-group populations as well as the mainstream. The inability to confront serves the interests of admitted racists and their colonial traditions. In the aftermath, African-American and other so-called minority-race victim groups are psychologically predisposed to discrimination as an internalized American norm.

Confronting the perils of racial strife will no doubt test the fiber of the American social terrain. Such a challenge risks the potential to do harm because it is very provocative and complex. But the fact that discrimination is inherently racist suggests that confronting such a provocative topic literally is a healthy and socially appropriate way to benefit Americans of all races and ultimately humanity in general. Hence, the eventual elimination of racism at home and abroad is intended by the analysis of victim-group discrimination. This analysis must appropriately begin with how racism is defined.

Racism, according to Michael Banton, is the original “ism” of American discrimination and refers to the efforts of a dominant racial group to exclude a dominated racial group from sharing in the material and symbolic rewards of status and power [1]. It differs from the various other forms of exclusion in that qualification is contingent upon observable and assumed physiological traits [2]. These traits, resulting from European colonization, imply the inherent superiority of dominant racial groups that are then rationalized as a natural order of the human biological universe [3]. The most zealous proponents of racism profess that lighter-skinned, Caucasian racial groups are superior to darker-skinned, non-Caucasian racial groups (people of color) [4]. Proponents postulate that they alone have been endowed with the capacities necessary to bring about civilization as indicated by Western sovereignties. The so-called advancing civilization was initially a thinly veiled form of racism devoted to rationalizing the right of Caucasian Europeans to embark on a worldwide mission aimed at conquering and eventually dominating all people of color [5]. By way of conquest and colonization, Europeans left no Third World terrain untouched. After centuries of domination, the mission to civilize non-Europeans has necessitated a universal, almost mystic belief in the racist power of skin color to elevate or demote [6].

Racism has prevailed as one of the most subtle but no less devastating and tenacious social problems in the modern era, consequent to differentiations in skin color [7]. Volumes have contributed little to any demise of consequence. Germane to the American version is the evolution of the black/white dichotomy,

that of the African-American and Euro-American. The black/white dichotomy by definition is predicated on the notion that racism manifests as discrimination by Euro-Americans, particularly against African-Americans [8]. There should be no doubt about the importance of this assumption. Conversely, notwithstanding current levels of group diversity, to characterize racism and the extended discrimination in such a narrow context does a disservice to the human endeavor. It enables the absurd alignment of civility with a single group and, in fact, provides a conduit for the continued oppression of victim groups as a whole. However, deserving of sympathy, the role of victims is no less urgent and pathological. While their undertaking of racism may not be typical of normal scientific investigations, its existence cannot be overlooked in resolution of the problem [9].

Among victim-group Americans, manifestations of racism relative to discrimination are a direct result of Caucasian race domination associated with colonization. Domination of victim groups by Caucasian populations allowed for the exportation of colonial values, from which victim groups—including people of color—gained orientation: Pertaining to skin color, the uppermost in status became those who most approximated the skin tone of the Eurocentric masses and the least being an opposite extreme [4]. In an attempt to circumvent humiliation, victim groups conformed to the racist denigration of dark skin. Their efforts necessitated a value system that is, in many ways, not only physiologically alien to people of color but psychologically brutal as well [10]. The result is a configuration of racism whereby color-based discrimination between people of color extends from the racist black/white dichotomy to the behavior of all. Under the circumstances, those who are darkest suffer the most acute instances of racist discrimination in all sectors of society. They are the victims who, in the greatest numbers, are counted among the descendants of Africans as the most hated and despised members of humanity. Verification of the fact is that racism in America is arguably among the most tenacious of social ills descended from Western aggression. This blemish upon Western civilization has been all but trivialized as a critical source of social pathology, given the status and power differential between the oppressed and the perpetrators of oppression. The institutionalization of racism in America was accordingly persistent in an effort to maintain colonial advantage, despite the social risks incurred by African-Americans. This meant that racism as relevant to victim-group discrimination would be extremely stressful and relevant to victim-group behavior [11]. Traits such as skin color, implied by race, symbolize the assumed inherent superiority of lighter-skinned dominant race groups who have enabled acts of hatred as a strategy for enhancing quality of life. That belief is so potent as to visit pathological consequences upon the quality of life experienced by African-Americans. It is quantitatively demonstrated in the rates of FBI hate crime statistics as illustrated in Table 3.1 [12], a dramatic account of racism directed at darker-skinned African-Americans compared to other lighter-skinned, victim-group populations. Statistical data on hate crimes in the United States are contained in the annual report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Data are from submissions of 11,211 law enforcement agencies to the FBI. The report is required under the 1990 Hate Crime Statistics Act and the Church Arson Prevention Act of 1996, which began in response to the burning of black churches.

Table 3.1 Hate crimes by race and number of incidents

Race	Number of incidents
Antiwhite	993
Antiblack	3,120
Anti-Indian	36
Anti-Asian	347
Anti-biracial	214

According to 1999 FBI statistics, the number of demographic categories subjected to hate crimes is considerable. However, except for antiwhite—with white not being a minority—hate crimes all other groups in comparison to antiblack are minimal. In fact, the number of antiwhite hate crimes is less than a third in proportion to antiblack crimes. This is so despite the fact that the overall black portion of the US population is less than one-fifth of that of whites. It thus becomes imperative in the analysis of racism to comprehend the dynamics between victim-group discrimination and the distribution and use of power. In the absence of power, the perpetration of racist discrimination becomes ineffectual. Associated with power, racist discrimination perpetuates the dominance of one race group over another. Thus, it becomes compulsory that dominant groups maintain superior numbers, cohesion, and resources that are enabled by racial discrimination [13]. Victim-group Americans may lack numerical superiority and, in fact, are more often culturally aligned by aspiration with the Caucasian mainstream population [14]. Those closest aligned are more cohesive and may have access to the control of resources. As a result, despite being victims, they have relative power. Those of lesser proximity to the mainstream may profess numerical superiority among the victim population, but are less cohesive and lack the necessary power alignment to enhance their quality of life. Therefore, they are powerless by comparison to their more willing victim-race counterparts, which helps promote and sustain victim-group discrimination.

Racism and resultant discrimination among victim-group populations prevails because it is ubiquitous and historically extended from the political alignment of nation sovereignties. The longevity of its manifestation has preceded the American sovereignty. Hence, extended from racism, previously colonized Nicaraguan forefathers considered skin color to have an influence on the manner in which common folk interacted. *Mestizos* (racially mixed persons) referred to the darker-skinned *Costenos* (persons of African descent) in derogatory terms [15]. For Cuban-Americans, the idealization of light skin has existed historically despite elimination attempts of Castro’s Revolution. Status in Cuba is continually based on gradations of skin color and affects all aspects of Cuban life, as does the racism that might be experienced in the United States, both covertly and overtly [16]. Thus, racism is not limited to one group or color. Following their racist conquest or domination by Europeans, migrants from India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, and Sri Lanka constantly sought ways to prove themselves “white” once they settled in America [17]. In the process, vehement forms of racist victim-group discrimination have been enacted against dark-skinned citizens, particularly African-Americans by victim-group populations who aspire to be white.

According to Eduardo Bonilla-Silva and David R. Dietrich [18], victim groups such as Asian-Americans are evolving into honorary whites, evident in social norms including discrimination. In more familiar terms, Bonilla-Silva, of Puerto-Rican descent, states, “. . . contend that racial stratification and the rules of racial (re)cognition in the United States are becoming Latin America-like.” That is, due to the evolution of miscegenation in the United States, the previous mono-race category has become all but irrelevant, as purported in Latin America. In fact, it is fast becoming the norm as a complex model of racial stratification. In the United States, that model is a triracial hierarchy. At the very top of that hierarchy are Caucasian Americans; at the very bottom are black Americans and associated blacks; Asian-Americans are evolving into an intermediary group otherwise regarded as “honorary whites.” A similar system existed in South Africa, during the time of South Africa’s formal apartheid, by the same assimilation process whereby mixed-race offspring were located at an intermediary level of the race status hierarchy. Whites were at the top of the hierarchy, blacks at the very bottom, while the mixed-race offspring of both—referred to as “coloreds”—were spared some measure of racism and discrimination.

In the United States, the emerging rank ordering of honorary whites is grist for victim-group discrimination because it is organized by skin color, with Caucasian, light skin tone regarded as the ideal. Therefore, the new honorary whites will include assimilated light-skinned Latinos, light-skinned biracial persons, Japanese, Korean, Indian, Chinese, and most Middle Eastern Americans. Other Asian-Americans will be located as associated blacks relative to skin color, including dark-skinned Latinos, Vietnamese, Cambodians, Laotians, and Filipinos to some extent.

This detailed model of an emerging racial order, constructed by Bonilla-Silva and Dietrich, is heuristic and cannot be considered as definitive. They acknowledge that the status of some groups, such as Arab Americans, may change given social and political events. Some groups, such as Samoans and Micronesians, have not been acknowledged as a matter of data limitations. However, as it pertains to victim-group discrimination and Asian-Americans, the United States is poised to become a “pigmentocracy,” wherein those who are most discriminated against will be of the darkest skin color and more than likely descended from Africans. They will be confronted by discrimination less often by white Americans and more often by lighter-skinned victim groups including Asian-Americans, who by virtue of internalized white ideals discriminate for a better quality of life and the avoidance of being discriminated against themselves having less power to do otherwise.

The racist perception of African-Americans having dark skin is significant in their willingness to discriminate. It evolved from a history of Western racism, but is today enabled by historical and modern-day stereotypes [19]. Scholars and practitioners who are amenable to such stereotypes permeate the ranks of political, educational, economic, and judicial institutions. Furthermore, these professionals have enabled the validation of stereotypes in their research and publication of otherwise bogus conclusions regarding non-European subjects. Although the literature contains acknowledgement of racist objectives in the stereotyping of African-American men, academia has been less willing to acknowledge those objectives

with equal enthusiasm. As a result, African-American men are perceived as racist stereotypes, physically strong but intellectually dull, commensurate with the aim of denigrating dark skin. Their performance on IQ and other so-called standardized tests of intelligence arms racists with the necessary tools to construct spurious arguments with which to make their racist claims. In an effort to illuminate the dynamics of victim-group discrimination, it is thus compulsory to explore the impact of stereotype upon the reputations of a victim-group population. The objective is to provide a heretofore unavailable but plausible alternative to race-based intelligence differentials, which victim groups internalize as the norm where relevant to the quality-of-life aspirations pertaining to African-American men and the "ism" of race.

Historically, racist stereotypes of African-American men have occupied American folklore. According to Walter Lippmann, stereotypes are "pictures in our heads" [20]. Howard Ehrlich [21] thinks of them as "a set of beliefs and disbeliefs about any group of people." The esteemed Gordon Allport [22] insists, "a stereotype is an exaggerated belief associated with a category." Much like prejudice, definitions of stereotype highlight certain aspects of African-American men while completely ignoring others. Unfortunately, for such men, what is highlighted has been limited to the negative.

Western scientist B. Lombardo [23] referred to two distinct stereotypes, which connoted African-American men. The first is the "brute." The second is "sambo." Both were initially developed by Europeans to secure their position in Western world society and simultaneously denigrate Africans for purposes of racist subordination. The brute stereotype defined Africans as primitive, temperamental, violent, and sexually powerful and the sambo as child-like. The brute stereotype, in particular, was effective in conveying African mental dullness and lack of self-control. Europeans and their Western cohort in America then validated racist beliefs about dark-skinned men, enabling a status hierarchy between Africans and themselves. Extended from this racist hierarchy is the internalization of racist stereotypes by victim groups not exclusive of African-American men themselves.

In reality, Euro-Americans have relied upon stereotypes to call attention to racist beliefs that characterize African-American men in a derogatory context. What is more, stereotypes cannot presume the accuracy of fact. Nonetheless, when influenced by racism Euro-Americans discriminate and apply stereotypes to exaggerations or speculations about African-Americans, which are untrue [24]. Even the otherwise intelligent and conscientious who would reject such stereotypes may firmly believe that they extend from some element of fact. Subsequently, a racist stereotype is a communal but unscientifically validated belief about the performances of out-group populations, meaning people of color and other victim groups. This assumption acknowledges the existence of in-group stereotypes that extend from such beliefs. However, in-group stereotypes are normally accommodated by the possession of power and are thus favorable images that powerful in-groups ordinarily cherish about themselves [25]. A critical necessity is to expose the groundless and derogatory stereotypes frequently held by the powerful Euro-American in-group about the abilities of Euro-Americans as an extension of Western intellectual

superiority. Furthermore, the existence of a derogatory African-American stereotype suggests that those who subscribe to it are at best ignorant or at worst racist. The potency of either is formidable to the extent that Euro-Americans may underachieve in various areas, but are otherwise gifted. Thus, stereotype may influence the task performance of all races in ways similar to how intellectual stereotypes influence the academic performance of all students, including African-Americans, where all other matters are equal. Subsequently, those who would ascribe to the “dumb black” stereotype then attribute any nonstereotypical behavior, trait, or talent among African-American men to luck or, as in the mulatto hypothesis, suggesting light skin or otherwise European ancestry. When they are successful, the public at large is convinced that racist stereotypes for black men are associated with intellect and are relevant to the job market and other quality-of-life institutions.

Amid the racist discourse on black intelligence as a scientifically proposed denigration of dark skin, in 1969 psychologist Arthur Jensen published a paper in the *Harvard Educational Review*, entitled “How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?” Jensen’s position is that government programming for compensatory education had failed. That failure was inherent in an attempt to improve IQ scores, particularly pertaining to children of African descent. As known by psychologists, the IQ scores of African-Americans average less than that of Euro-Americans. Those who disagree with Jensen’s position contend that these differences are a result of social and economic disadvantages. As per Jensen, such a rationale justified “wasteful” spending on compensatory educational programs designed to equalize opportunities between citizens of African and European descent. The failure of these programs, according to Jensen, suggests a need to question presuppositions on which such programs are based, particularly the argument that IQ differences between races are due to environmental influences. Jensen’s need to question this argument focuses on two major assumptions: (a) IQ tests are valid measurements of intelligence and (b) methods of estimating the genetic component of IQ are valid. Succinctly put, the genetic component of IQ is the extent to which IQ differences between persons of African and European descent are due to genetic heritage. Absent rigorous scientific methodology, Jensen proposes that environment accounts for only about 20% of the IQ differences between such persons [26].

The crux of Jensen’s argument is shared by other psychologists who prefer to stress class-difference rationales, as does Richard Herrnstein. According to Herrnstein’s research, upper- and middle-class children score significantly superior to working-class children. Jensen does not refute Herrnstein’s class differences because both ultimately agree on the genetic rationale. In 1995, their work was followed by Herrnstein teamed with political scientist Charles Murray and published the controversial book *The Bell Curve* [27]. *The Bell Curve* is a voluminous study about the assumed inherited intelligence differential between dark-skinned persons of African descent and light-skinned persons of European descent. According to the authors, genetic endowment will dictate intelligence, socioeconomic achievement, and social pathology, which will be increasingly unequally distributed across the world’s racial populations. As societies become more technological, the authors contend that stratification by cognitive ability will prevail. Given the genetic nature

of this phenomenon, social programs and other government compensatory interventions are then ineffective and a waste of tax dollars. This notion is the grist of the racist stereotype that has permeated the Western academy since its origin. *The Bell Curve* has been unsubstantiated as a valid premise that manages some validity. The results are manifested in the school performance of black males and their experiences. How black boys perform is contained in the racist context of their American social experience, which contributes to victim-group discrimination as an extension of internalized racist norms.

Black boys are exposed early to the racist stereotype of their intellectual inferiority. To rescue their self-esteem, they learn quickly that, if they want to be respected by their peers, they had better be “cool” and underachieve. In addition, if they are bright and achieve academically, they must be good athletes to make their intelligence simultaneously manly and cool. The bright black boy who is not athletic will be doomed to failure among his peers as well as being subjected to social isolation. He will be labeled “white” for doing well in school and will only be accepted if he is an athlete or decides to underachieve. This social ploy is quite common among black boys who, over the years, have become quite efficient at playing the game. Research suggests that underachievement was the most frequent problem of bright black boys, aged 11 years and older, assigned to an educational program called the Guidance Laboratory for Gifted and Talented students [28].

Unlike girls, black boys also face the prospects of dealing with kindergarten “red-shirting” as a consequence of achieving manhood ideals. Red-shirting is a practice whereby parents intentionally delay enrollment in kindergarten as long as possible in hopes that when the boys enter school they will be larger in size than their peers, thus allowing for sports success. This is a practice that is gaining popularity, particularly among districts that allow variation in the age at which boys can be enrolled. Such a practice is likely harmful intellectually to the brightest of black boys, who can become bored and eventually discouraged by education by the time they reach the fourth grade. The association of education with the importance of sports is a reflection of stereotype and the significance of manhood in the West and, especially in the black community, is relevant to the racist stereotype of their resultant juvenile delinquency.

A study by Nicholas Colangelo and Barbara Kerr [29] focuses on academic underachievers and suggest that almost all (90%) were boys. In the same study, the ratio of young boys compared to young girls in the special Counseling Laboratory designed specifically to accommodate academic underachievers was an astounding six to one. Undoubtedly, stereotype alone will not suffice as the single cause of juvenile delinquency among black boys. However, there is substantial evidence in support of male social coping with gender identity expectations (for example, manhood) as a significant factor. When the academic talents of black boys are associated with weakness, their classroom underachievement becomes a useful strategy for asserting independence, strength, and thus manhood within the peer group setting. By performing below intellectual capacity, black boys gain acceptance and respect among peers who are influenced by society’s racist stereotypes. Subsequently, they submit to manhood subcultural ideals, which is exclusive of academic success.

Unfortunately, their subcultural strategy for acquiring respect among peers comes through delinquency and failed academic potential. The society at large, by way of various media outlets, has actively promoted racist stereotypes of black males. These stereotypes are not assumed to be relevant to the black male self-concept and potential for victim-group discrimination, indicated by the historical associations of black male youth with crime. That association is historical and assigns antebellum notions of black beast rapist to dark-skinned male children.

In 1931, on an Alabama train, several young black men met two white females, now known to have been prostitutes. All were riding the train illegally because they did not have the money to pay for fares. In a search for illegal passengers, an official stumbled upon them in hiding, and, in an effort to defend their reputations and avoid being arrested, the females accused the black youths of holding them by force and raping them [30]. In Alabama, the heart of Dixie, the belief that these black males—however young—had violated the sanctity of white womanhood evoked a public uproar [30]; the entire South was shocked and appalled without attempting to discover what actually happened. So enraged were Southern whites that the case was brought to trial in Scottsboro, Alabama, amid worldwide attention. After an embittered trial and daily threats upon their lives, the innocent “Scottsboro Boys” were eventually convicted and sent to prison.

It is difficult to comprehend the violence that surrounded black males in the South during the reign of segregation. But the violence went unchecked because black males had been portrayed effectively as a criminal stereotype by racists. Any fate they encountered could then be assumed deserved. And although the Scottsboro Boys were innocent and eventually released from prison, they had spent most of their young lives there [30]. Time and again, such injustices would recur because the criminal stereotype cleansed the collective American psyche of the social and economic racist injustices perpetrated daily upon black and other dark-skinned people in general. Evidence of its tenacity is suggested by modern-day accounts of similar racist accusations against black males who were falsely accused of crimes, as in the following incidents.

Late one evening in 1989, an upper middle-class investment banker was taking her daily jog through New York City’s Central Park. The victim—a white female—was violently attacked and raped, reportedly by a gang of black youths [31]. The theme was old, familiar, and too often carried by media, inciting frenzy around the case by describing the accused as “animals” and a “pack.” Without using the term “natural criminal,” print media managed to make the point via implication and photographic illustrations. Although this was not the first or last case of its kind in New York, it was a major story of local newspapers around the country. It was as if a message was being sent that the threat of the black male was real and indeed unexaggerated.

More recently, a black male was accused of murder, accused by the husband of the pregnant victim [32]. The nation assumed the guilt of the accused based upon media hype and larger-than-life photographs of the murder scene. Only after one of the accomplices involved in the frame-up came forth with the truth was the alleged perpetrator, a black man named Bennett, released from police custody. The belief

that Bennett was guilty was arguably a reaction to his dark skin. Because dark skin contrasts with the “attractive” light-skin norm of the mainstream population, it is necessarily vilified in the subjective assessment of guilt. This has contributed to the victimization of black males as a racist criminal stereotype, males who cannot conform to the light-skin norms of the mainstream society. Hence, in comparison to those with lighter skin, black males with darker skin are more often falsely accused of criminal activity [33]. And given the power of media to impose norms, such victimization may to some extent be perpetuated by all groups, including some among blacks. This means that the assumptions of black guilt are taken for granted by white Americans, as in the case of Susan Smith, a woman who did not hesitate to implicate a black male in the commission of a crime that she committed.

The case of Susan Smith, of Union, South Carolina, is a dramatic manifestation of the black male, criminal stereotype as perpetrated by mass media [34]. Smith said a black man had attacked her and the unknown assailant had drowned her young sons and escaped with her car. Well aware of the criminal stereotype, Smith assumed that the all-too-believable scenario of the criminal black male would go unquestioned in the Southern town. Fortunately, police were not so reluctant to question the case. Their investigation led to the arrest and conviction of Smith. Lost in the account of what had occurred was the fact that a black male had been cited as culprit in the crime. The major media headline emphasized the drowning of two children while ignoring the criminal indictment of an entire group of innocent citizens [34]. In addition, all of the accused in the aforementioned cases were innocent. Unfortunately, those accused in the Central Park Jogger case had been proven innocent via DNA testing only after having served several years of incarceration.

The oppression of dark-skinned populations that can be attributed to racism is a much too simplistic explanation without giving psychological account of those so inclined. Following World War II, sociologists at the University of California-Berkeley investigated the notion of a person-centered hypothesis, which resulted in a detailed account of the racist psyche. Researchers concluded that there is a specific personality type that is predisposed to rigidity and group hierarchical authority, hence an authoritarian personality. The essence of their psychology is descended from the in-group/out-group authoritarian dichotomous paradigm. In this case, light-skinned Americans occupied in-group status and those with dark skin occupied the out-group. The result is a subject inclined to blind obedience and submission to domination in committing heinous acts of racial violence [35]. To illustrate this, investigators gathered empirical evidence from American respondents using clinical interviews and attitude tests. What they consistently found was the tendency of some respondents toward obedience, which they again defined as authoritarian personalities. Relative to the authoritarian dichotomous paradigm, in-group authoritarian personalities were prone to prejudice against out-group often dark-skinned Americans and also maintained specific sentiments regarding authority. Such sentiments included submission to those in power, harshness to those they regarded as powerless, and a pronounced belief in the significance of power and domination of others. The authoritarian personality was associated with a consistent agreement with such statements on the attitude scales as, “Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn,” “Most of our social

problems would be solved if we could somehow get rid of the immoral, the crooked and feeble-minded people,” and “People can be divided into two distinct classes: [for example, dichotomous] the weak and the strong” [35].

University of California researchers further contend that this pattern of attitudes was a demonstration of subliminal personality traits that subjects may have formed during childhood. Subsequently, respondents who scored high on minority prejudice and authoritarianism also depicted their childhoods as being dominated by a rigid, all-powerful father figure who demanded their absolute obedience. In a Freudian manner, children dominated to such an extent had few options other than to suppress or negate any hostility toward their power-superior father. They could not afford the mere acknowledgement of such hostility, necessitating that its existence be forced from consciousness. They developed what psychoanalysts describe as a “reaction formation” [36]. That is, as the powerless victims of powerful fathers’ domination, they adopted the inverse response by becoming totally obedient as a matter of justifiable virtue. However, their hostile feelings were not diminished completely, but instead were redirected at less formidable victims, including dark-skinned racial minorities or other less powerful out-groups. To sustain this redirection of hostility, they placed high value on “toughness” and an equally valued “taboo on weakness,” which buffered any disgust for racial discrimination. Thus, the hostility that these respondents could not acknowledge was redirected as existing externally in others. In Freudian terms, they once again displayed projection where the ego expels any personal attributes that it cannot assimilate into its ideal personality structure [36]. Using such logic, any out-group element is then perceived by those prone to racism as hordes of destructive barbarians who, given the chance, would annihilate peaceful and/or weaker populations. Thus, in Western parlance, out-group blacks, Latinos, Asians, Jews, immigrants, and others required control by subjection to the power of in-group authority and, if necessary, racial violence.

Relative to principles of the in-group/out-group authoritarian dichotomous paradigm, classical definitions of authoritarianism emphasize the rejection of out-groups. In the West, out-groups include any who differ from a predominantly white, Judeo-Christian population [37]. Recently, this particular form of group psychology has manifested an emphasis on absolute devotion to the in-group population in response to what it perceives as an assault upon Western civilization. The reaction further contributes to the reinforcement of racism where risk of death is not only ignored but may be a critical part of strategy. As a result, members of dark-skinned populations are victimized by race category without objection from the civil elements of society. This is so, given the fact that the United States is a male-dominated patriarchy, as are most Western sovereignties. Therefore, gender and/or sex cannot be denied as relevant to the historical and contemporary acts of overt racism and discrimination against dark-skinned, victim-group populations. M. Horowitz and J. M. Rabbie [38] note there are more authoritarian personalities among males than females:

The pattern of these findings resembles that reported by Downing and Monaco. . . for authoritarians and non-authoritarians. One might say that, like authoritarians, males are relatively predisposed to perceive aggregates of individuals as groups; conversely, that females, like

non-authoritarians, are predisposed to perceive aggregates of individuals as separate persons. Being disposed to view others as members, males rate ingroup members higher than outgroup members. . . [38].

In an effort to sustain itself, the authoritarian personality necessarily sublimates any tendencies and/or impulses it perceives as unacceptable. Thus, any matter such as guilt for crimes of racial violence posing threat must be eliminated from consciousness requiring a rigid set of defenses to operate. Relaxing rigidity will threaten to compromise defenses, which would result in a breakthrough of the despised sublimated tendencies. These despised tendencies, when sublimated too rigorously or too soon in life, do not lose their potency. Conversely, immediate or failed sublimation inhibits rather than assists in the process of rigidity and sublimation [35]. A healthy ego that is compromised will be confronted with the possibility of becoming completely besieged by sublimated influences. Increased rigidity of defense mechanisms will enable the subject to tolerate the increased threat. Despite such rigidity, sublimated influences do manage escape from control. Intense instinctual impulses are constantly taxing the ego to the extent that it must be forever vigilant. Legitimate control occupies a limited domain of the personality, severely distorting its appropriate application. Thus, as long as control and domination exceed other conditions and as long as Western civilization makes available permissible portals for sublimated impulses, societal functioning—however limited—can be realized. It is through this in-group/out-group dichotomous paradigm that powerful authoritarian types enable guiltless acts of racism [39].

Since the colonial era, America has undergone dramatic changes in the phenotype of its population, but its racist history is acted out against black males in other no less insidious ways. This is because black males are located on the extreme opposite end of the racial equation, attributed to their gender and dark skin. A nation that once viewed itself as “white” is today experiencing a major shift in the ratio between dark- and light-skinned people that will likely carry on into the foreseeable future. Decades of prejudice and social unrest have given way to a just and civil society. Black males are no longer shackled and led away at slave auctions; their lynching and segregation exists only as a topic of history books. But what has prevailed psychologically may be equally brutal and devastating [40]. Years of injustice and suffering at the hands of a racist mainstream power structure have created a need for justification among more civil-minded Americans. Out of this need was created the black-male-as-criminal stereotype [41]. By viewing him as a threat and someone to fear, civil-minded Americans could resolve the guilt that would have normally been associated with the racist colonial traditions of another era pertaining to all black and dark-skinned people. Overt occasions of violence have been replaced by stereotypes of dark-skinned people as animal-like and unable to conform to the order of a civil society. This provided a means for America to rescue itself from the psychological consequences of its actions and simultaneously maintain a sense of civil accord. Not only was the American psyche cleansed but, despite the prevailing racism, it contributed to the positioning of America as a moral leader among the nations of the world in both the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

Racism, sexism, classism, colorism, and victim-group discrimination are included among the various American “isms” brought about by Western racism and colonialism. As a result, few among the modern, more diverse American demographic have escaped being victimized by the oppressions of discrimination. Racism, however, remains the original “ism” upon which the foundation of the various racist traditions of American discrimination rests. Without some manifestation of racism, it is plausible that other variations of discrimination could not exist. The fact that they do is served by the racist traditions of Western culture, which—being a patriarchy—has historically located the focus of its oppression upon dark-skinned males. Volumes of empirical research have been published to attest to this. Discrimination against black males thus permeates society at every level, for the most part conveyed by stereotyped media images that have become so commonplace that victims have internalized such images as a norm. Racism then dominates the environment of all, whereby it has become virtually impossible that any could escape its influence whether they oppress or are the victims of those who oppress. In the aftermath, members of other victim-group populations evidence the same discriminatory prejudices commonly associated with racism in the American mainstream, but have not yet been noted or held accountable. Thus blacks and other people of color discriminate against others by skin color; among women, white women especially discriminate against victims by skin color; gay and lesbian Americans discriminate against their own and others by skin color; and newly arrived immigrants to America display an overt disdain for African-Americans, whose dark skin they may have learned to despise through their homeland, cultural traditions. They all have become amenable to various manifestations of discrimination having been oppressed themselves by white racism. Only when the social scientific community is willing to acknowledge such discrimination by victim groups, addressing it through research and documenting it via scholarly publication, will the role of victim populations in the perpetuation of American discrimination be duly illustrated and hence resolved.

References

1. Kitano, H. (1985). *Race relations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
2. Wilson, M. (1992). What difference could a revolution make? group work in the new Nicaragua. *Social Work with Groups*, 15(2/3), 301–314.
3. Minor, N., & McGauley, L. (1988). A different approach: dialogue in education. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 2(1), 127–140.
4. Welsing, F. (1970). *The cress theory of color confrontation and racism*. Washington, DC: C-R Publishers.
5. Daly, A., Jennings, J., Beckett, J., & Leashore, B. (1995). Effective coping strategies of African Americans. *Social Work*, 40(2), 40–48.
6. Hyde, C. (1995). The meanings of whiteness. *Qualitative Sociology*, 18(1), 87–95.
7. Hernton, C. (1964). *Sex and racism in America*. New York: Grove.
8. Sember, C. (1976). *Sexual racism*. New York: Elsevier Scientific.
9. Aro, J. (1995). The authority of reason and passion for science: the rules of sociological method. *Sociologia*, 32(2), 81–89.

10. Keefe, T. (1984). Alienation and social work practice. *Social Casework*, 65(3), 145–153.
11. Wilson, W. (1980). *The declining significance of race*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
12. Federal Bureau of Investigation [FBI] (17 October 1999). *Crime in the United States, uniform crime reports, 1998*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.
13. Schermerhorn, R. (1978). *Comparative ethnic relations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
14. Russell, K., Wilson, M., & Hall, R. E. (1992). *The color complex: the “last taboo” among African Americans*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
15. Lancaster, R. (1991). Skin color, race, and racism in Nicaragua. *Ethnology*, 30(4), 339–353.
16. Canizares, R. (1990). Cuban racism and the myth of the racial paradise. *Ethnic Studies Report*, 8(2), 27–32.
17. Mazumdar, S. (1989). Racist response to racism: the Aryan myth and South Asians in the US. *South Asia Bulletin*, 9(1), 47–55.
18. Hall, R. E. (Ed.). (2008). *Racism in the 21st century: an empirical analysis of skin color*. New York: Springer.
19. Hall, R. E. (1993). Clowns, buffoons, and gladiators: media portrayals of black men. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 1, 239–251.
20. Klineberg, O. (1951). The scientific study of national stereotypes. *International Social Science Bulletin*, 3, 505–515.
21. Ehrlich, H. (1973). *The sociology of prejudice*. New York: Wiley.
22. Allport, G. (1958). *The nature of prejudice*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
23. Lombardo, B. (1978). The Harlem Globetrotters and the perception of the African American imagery. *Physical Educator*, 35(2), 60–63.
24. Bogle, D. (1989). *Toms, coons, mulattoes, mammies, and bucks: an interpretive history of African Americans in American film*. New York: Continuum.
25. Charnofsky, H. (1968). Baseball player self-conception versus the popular image. *International Review of Sport Sociology*, 3, 44–46.
26. Jensen, A. (1969). How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement? *Harvard Educational Review*, 39, 2.
27. Herrnstein, R., & Murray, C. (1994). *The bell curve*. New York: Free Press.
28. Kerr, B. (2000). Gender and Genius. The College of William and Mary. <http://cfge.wm.edu/Gifted%20Educ%20Articles/GenderGenius.htm>. Accessed June 26, 2009.
29. Colangelo, N., & Kerr, B. A. (1993). A comparison of gifted underachievers and gifted high achievers. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 37(4), 155–161.
30. Conrad, E., & Patterson, H. (1950). *Scottsboro boys* (2nd ed.). New York: Doubleday.
31. Harrison, B. (1989, August). The jogger running for her life. *Mademoiselle*, 122.
32. Carlson, M. (1990, January). Presumed innocent. *Time*, 10–14.
33. Hall, R. E. (1993). Clowns, buffoons, and gladiators: media portrayals of black men. *Journal of Men's Studies*, 1, 239–251.
34. Jones, T. (1995, July 23). Smith found guilty of murdering sons. *Washington Post*, 1.
35. Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Norton & Co.
36. Gleitman, H. (1986). *Psychology*. New York: Norton & Company.
37. Kitano, H. (1997). *Race relations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
38. Horowitz, M., and Rabbie, J. (1982). Individuality and membership in the intergroup system. In H. Tajfel, (Ed.), *Social identity and intergroup relations* (241–274). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
39. D'Souza, D. (1991). *Illiberal education: the politics of race and sex on campus*. New York: Free Press.
40. Kinder, D. (1986). The continuing American dilemma: white resistance to racial change 40 years after Myrdal. *Journal of Social Issues*, 42, 161–171.
41. Leinen, S. (1984). *Black police, white society*. New York: New York University Press.

Chapter 4

African-Americans: The Idealization of Light Skin

Along with many other antebellum traditions was a strong race-based belief system that was all but totally and factually irrelevant. That belief system dictated that whites by virtue of race alone were entitled to what America had to offer because they were a superior race. Such belief, without interference of an alternative view, preceded the guiltless discrimination against victim-group African-Americans regarding quality of life. Whenever whites lost the ability to exercise political or otherwise superior power, they inevitably sought ways to gain advantage by advocating discriminatory policies. The objective of this Eurocentric activism was to reinforce colonial traditions, making white access to wealth a birthright.

The aforementioned white birthright to wealth conflicted with the American rhetorical ethos. But by virtue of power, the white mainstream population promoted an entitlement belief system that became accepted as fact by all, including victim-group populations. According to C. M. Pierce, entitlement beliefs can have a major impact upon common human interaction despite that much of the research remains focused upon the mainstream [1]. Hence, antebellum whites developed a universal sense of ownership and superiority that has imposed upon their human interaction with people of color and other victim groups for centuries. Was such a system of self-serving policies justified? Regarding victim populations, what constituted self-interest and to what extent was it a manifestation of victimism, that is, victim-group discrimination? The group in power may have earned the military right to dominate, as indeed they may have earned the right to set policies in their own best interest. Yet dark-skinned African-American victim groups having less ability to dominate without any formidable balance in power may have encouraged discrimination and a universal sense of entitlement by race ultimately pathological and self-destructive to all of mankind.

Belief in entitlement is a pointed but traditional construct, able to withstand the scrutiny of scientific investigation. In terms of power, the differential accumulation between oppressor and the oppressed was obvious [2]. The manifestations were historically apparent in the employment demarcations between white and black Americans as well as dark-skinned and light-skinned blacks, which involved a complex of entitlement networks. In a world dominated by postcolonial traditions, such Americans enabled the tendencies toward discrimination to the point of its acceptance as a casual and indeed preferred norm. Subsequently, the ability of both

white and black American citizens to sustain an optimal quality of life was limited. The oppressor–oppressed dichotomy may have been dramatically confirmed by race, but it was more extensive and complex than had been presumed. In the aftermath, white America experienced a better quality of life not irrelevant to black transgressions. The white American expected and accepted as commonplace the oppression suffered by black Americans, who in turn tacitly agreed. As such, during the antebellum era, some among mulatto blacks in concert with like-minded whites contributed what little power had by the black American community to white American quality of life while simultaneously oppressing the self. Pierce [1] suggests the following metaphor:

in a queued line, a black is thirteen times more likely than chance to be asked to yield space to a white who wishes to pass perpendicularly through the line. After a lifetime of such routines, the black has donated life to the white because he has used up so much time, space and energy aiding the white. The immobilization may be accompanied by micro-changes physiologically that also accumulate and hasten his earlier demise. Hence, the white accepts as his due the door opening. The black donates, gratuitously, toward the life of a white every time he opens the door. In the next two decades such entitlements may be modified as blacks and whites view things differently [1].

According to Pierce, the totality of “human interactions” may be contingent upon the dynamics of entitlement as relative to various forms of discrimination, including black victim-group discrimination [1]. Subsequently, these interactions introduce a normalized repertoire of insidious behavioral sequences in any given interpersonal scenario. Facilitating complications is the association of entitlement with power and its extensions including the internalization of discriminatory norms by victim populations for selfish ends. What is of increasing concern is the determination as to whether or not entitlement norms would change substantially, such as discrimination by victim populations in the postcolonial era. Of particular concern by all is the quality of life insofar, as it allows for the welfare of some at the expense of others in an era of a more global human existence.

According to Gunnar Myrdal, Southern whites acted with deliberate intent upon their beliefs in the treatment of blacks. While race has never been proven to have any biological significance, during the antebellum era whites in general assumed so in the face of obvious evidence to the contrary. The fact is race and the racial characteristics of black people, such as skin color, were of minor importance to the status of black people in the South. The race conflict emerged irrelevant to facts because in order to understand the dynamics of power, black Americans as influenced by white Americans acted according to the implications of discrimination. Myrdal states:

to understand race conflict we need fundamentally to understand conflict and not race. We have concluded, further, from the actual power situation in America that the beliefs held by white people rather than those held by Negroes are of primary importance [3].

To understand victim-group discrimination among blacks, one must understand the beliefs about light-skinned blacks, referred to as mulattos. Such an understanding requires an appreciation of popular beliefs concerning blacks in general. First, the objective observer must be willing to challenge certain beliefs when they are

inaccurate. To their credit, a few social scientists have attempted to correct past wrongs. Such an effort did no doubt help rescue science from the political biases of racial hegemony. The next task in the effort of objective science will be the analysis of racial beliefs themselves as factual points of reference, that is, to document them scientifically, to investigate their causation, and then to determine their impact upon victim-group emotions, thoughts, and actions pertaining to their role in the discriminatory color caste system of American society.

Once beliefs are sustained over time, they take on the force of a tradition. Upon their arrival in the United States, black slaves were void of Western culture. As time progressed, differences between the two peoples were exacerbated by slavery, segregation, and social caste. Additionally, the hair texture and, in particular, the dark skin of blacks made them even more conspicuous and thus much easier to denigrate. Blackness was the opposite of whiteness in every way vis-à-vis skin color. Hence, dark skin represented ignorance because light skin represented intelligence. Light skin was a sign of morality because dark skin implied low morals and perhaps evil. Any culturally valued characteristic attached to white light skin necessitated black as the alternative. Even more oppressive is the fact that such characteristics were applied not by individual but by group, as in race. Ironically, the concept of race had not been clearly defined in the Southern white belief system. According to this belief system, black people are thousands of years behind whites in terms of physiological development. However, that presents a problem when considering the amount of time it takes for an advanced civilization to develop. Whites answered that question by insisting upon culture as being a matter of genetics. Likewise, the brains of black people were believed to cease development at a certain point, beyond which would have required they reach a state of culture equal to that of whites. The most eloquent and learned white scholars of the American Civil War antebellum era endorsed this belief with enthusiasm.

On the basis of a belief in white racial superiority, black inferiority was culturally demonstrated to victim-group blacks. Antebellum scholars pointed repeatedly to the lack of a black culture as indisputable evidence that blacks were indeed inferior. Subsequently, culture was the invention of the white race. Added to this belief in race was a white struggle to rationalize blackness as proof of the biological or cultural differences between races. The term "blood" was applied to account for ancestry in racial terms. To the typical Southerner, blood implied much more than biology or culture. It was perhaps the one belief upon which the entirety of Southern culture was based. By blood, Southerners satisfied belief in black inferiority totally independent of scientific proof or evidence. Any other civilized people would have regarded such beliefs as little more than the superstitions of backward peoples. An embrace of bloodline fantasies was evidence enough to subject dark-skinned Americans to segregation, which became tradition. The underlying assumption was that, by sectioning off the black population, whites were protecting themselves from something evil, immoral, sinful, and inferior—as a norm [4].

One of the most thorough accounts of racial inferiority is by Gunnar Myrdal, in his classic *An American Dilemma* [3]. According to Myrdal, investigation of specific beliefs about race must include specificity of needs for rationalization. Particular

beliefs appear to contain particular rationalization purposes aside from justifying the Southern caste. Almost all variety of black/white relations, each manifestation of discrimination, or each type of interracial policy presents its unique calls for justification. And, as would have been expected, every manner of racial differentiation real or imagined provided a means to preferred justifications. These manufactured justifications were embraced universally, similarly to the way the caste system operated. A few of the beliefs were associated with the rationalization of a specific aspect of the caste system while others were only remotely associated. The association was at times blatant, as when a certain belief was commonly attributed to a certain aspect of the caste system. At other times, the association was less obvious even to the point of being concealed from consciousness of the believer and the observer.

To an outside observer, many beliefs by whites about blacks border on the comic. The economic benefits of such beliefs, while otherwise obvious, would never reach the consciousness of the typical Southerner. For example, during the civil war antebellum era, whites believed that blacks became sleepy when working with machinery and that the group as a race lacked mechanical aptitude. Thus, when it was necessary to keep blacks from industry, profit rationales were immediately available. The need on the part of whites to denigrate blacks as incompetent, lazy, and less intelligent was motivated by their selfish interests to bar blacks from advancement and skilled management positions, which black members of the population internalized as well. Such beliefs also justified the denial of civil rights to black citizens, which even the white immigrant was afforded without justification.

In a nontotalitarian society, certain belief systems enable various forms of discrimination. Scholars of the behavioral sciences refer to this as hegemony. Hegemony is characteristic of the West and other paternalistic cultures. It is a very subtle—but no less potent—form of discrimination. In the United States, hegemony fosters an “us against them” mentality, referring not only to blacks and whites but to blacks and other victim-group populations. This notion of “us against them” may be the major component of Western culture, from which—according to Frances Cress Welsing [5]—the need to discriminate arises. It recapitulates itself at every level of society including what the victimized individual might think of himself. The existence of skin color discrimination among victim-group populations has been all but ignored because it does not fit the rhetorical objectives of our mainstream culture. According to James Baldwin, the root of African-American discrimination is directly related to skin color [6]. This would contradict much of the “black consciousness/power” rhetoric of the sixties. But, as noted in an article on dark skin and the cultural ideal of masculinity [7], the issue of skin color for African-Americans was never resolved, merely relegated underground. It may affect every phase of life, including self-concept [8]. Thus, a well-known phenomenon among African-Americans is rejection of their group membership. One way to express such rejection is through cultural preferences. For African-Americans, this may be manifested by emphasizing preferences for light skin and evaluating them to determine the ideal. Among black Americans, such thinking is a manifestation of victim-group discrimination that has a long and tenacious existence in American history.

Stephan Talty suggests that whites were for the most part indifferent to interactions between light- and dark-skinned blacks early in the antebellum. Their attitudes toward one another were of no more or less significance than any part of the Southern landscape, such as magnolia trees or chicken coops. But lighter-skinned blacks were becoming increasingly more conspicuous in the South. Their white-like skin color was known to cause confusion at slave auctions. Perhaps their light skin made it difficult to regard them as black. For example, in 1821 there was an auction of a light-skinned black woman and her children. They were described “as white as any of our citizens.” The Louisville community where the auction took place was so stunned that no one offered a bid for them, while dark-skinned blacks at the same auction were sold immediately. Apparently, bidding on white-looking blacks was all but impossible because whites were so disgusted with associations of light skin with bondage. On the other hand, light-skinned slaves who were black enough were prized at auctions. Female slaves in particular were sought after by white males for sexual exploitation, but black women who were light-skinned and appeared white were seen as a suggestion that white males were raping white women. In fact, a small number of whites had been kidnapped by other whites and then sold into slavery on such a basis. This took place prior to the Civil War and weighed heavily upon the white conscience. There were no official accounts of such slavery as most were merely rumors or hearsay, which probably increased the impact. But the fact is that white children, white immigrants, and white orphans were easily shipped south and sold into bondage to an unscrupulous auctioneer. Their stories, as grist of the rumor mill, were told in the memoirs and courtrooms of antebellum slave territories, which helped initiate the discriminatory attitude of light- and dark-skinned blacks toward one another [9].

In 1918, Edward Reuter conducted a thorough study on light-skinned blacks in the United States [10]. Based upon beliefs about light skin, concepts from science, religion, and motivation combined to form a mulatto hypothesis, stating that light-skinned blacks—being closer to white—were differentially regarded in relation to their dark-skinned counterparts. In every manner, whites believed them to be superior to dark-skinned, full-blooded blacks. The belief was based purely upon skin color, for in the event a mulatto black was born whose features were not consistent with the light skin phenotype, he would have no reason to claim special status or demean darker-skinned blacks. Likewise, any black born of dual dark-skinned black parentage, but who was by some unusual biological event born light-skinned, would be treated accordingly. Light skin was their marking of superiority and vehicle of discrimination. Thus, they enjoyed social, occupational, economic, and universal advantages because the mulatto hypothesis defined them as an exception among blacks. They became the favored class among slaves, often selected for the less rigorous work as they were considered able thinkers and generally closer to whites in every way. Hence, among trained mechanics and the most trusted house servants, the vast majority were light-skinned—whom dark-skinned blacks referred to as “house Negroes.” In addition, whites preferred light-skinned blacks to darker-skinned blacks by their “better appearance.” They were less offended by light skin and so felt more inclined to select such blacks for slave work, which brought them

into closest contact with whites. The end result accommodated the beginnings of victim-group discrimination where light- and dark-skinned black Americans began to enact forms of oppression both had been subjected to by whites. The most dramatic account is of light-skinned blacks owning black slaves.

Slavery is one of the cruelest forms of oppression known to mankind. It matters not the skin color of the discriminating perpetrator or the oppressed victim. Volumes of antebellum era literature attest to African-Americans victimized by white slave masters in the aftermath of the Atlantic slave trade. Almost nonexistent is literature that attests to African-Americans, by way of victim-group discrimination, engaging in the enslavement of other African-Americans. More often than not, the perpetrators were light-skinned African-Americans and their victims were dark-skinned. The slave trade participation of light-skinned African-Americans is a most dramatic historical illustration of victim-group discrimination. Although not always, during the antebellum such black slave owners were no less cruel in their treatment of black slaves than their white counterparts. By culture and political aspiration, they were indistinguishable from whites as the mulatto, that is, light-skinned offspring of white slave masters. In fact, the proportion of light-skinned blacks who owned darker-skinned black slaves exceeded the proportion of whites who were slave owners. Census data for 1860 document the fact that there were approximately 27 million whites in America and only 8 million resided in slaveholding states in the South [11]. The 1860 Census also recorded 385,000 persons who owned slaves. Assuming that all who owned slaves were white, this would amount to 1.4% of the nation's white population. Despite these data, all who took part in slave ownership were no less guilty of the most inhumane forms of aggression possible, but in fact not all were white.

The few historians who have acknowledged black slave ownership prefer to rationalize their doing so as somehow beneficial to the enslaved victim. Technical reasons are given such as the purchase of a child or spouse from a white master who may not have provided access to the necessary paper work was a frequent response. No doubt, such occasions did occur and may in fact have been justified. However, slavery under such circumstances was more often the exception than the norm. In most instances of black slave ownership, records suggest that blacks who owned black slaves did so for the same reasons as whites: profit. Included among these were Justus Angel and Mistress L. Horry of Colleton District, South Carolina. According to 1830 records, each owned 84 slaves. What is more, 1830 records note that 25% of the free Negro slave owners in South Carolina maintained ownership of 10 or more slaves. An astounding eight owned a total of 30 or more [11]. The 1860 Census data record a total of 4.5 million Negroes living in the United States; less than four million lived in Southern slaveholding states. Southern blacks who were not slaves but were free totaled 261,988 in number. Within that number, 10,689 blacks resided in the city of New Orleans. Many New Orleans blacks were of mixed-race, light-skinned Creole descent. According to African-American historian John Hope Franklin [11], more than 3000 free blacks in New Orleans owned slaves. Proportionately, they represented more than 25% of the free black population. In comparison to whites who owned slaves, 25% far exceeds the 1.4% of all American

whites and 4.8% of Southern whites. There are no data to suggest such blacks had merely purchased family members from whites for benefit of the slave.

Prominent historians have provided written accounts of blacks having owned slaves. In a work called *Black Confederates and Afro-Yankees in Civil War Virginia*, Ervin L. Jordan Jr. contends:

One of the more curious aspects of the free black existence in Virginia was their ownership of slaves. Black slave masters owned members of their family and freed them in their wills. Free blacks were encouraged to sell themselves into slavery and had the right to choose their owner through a lengthy court procedure [11].

Those who owned slaves, whether black or white, for the most part were more often financially modest. The majority owned no more than five slaves alongside whom they ate and worked. The exceptional were those slave masters who owned 50 or more slaves, which would have been no more than 1% of the population and were referred to as slave magnates. Astonishingly, in 1860 there existed at least six Negroes—likely light-skinned—living in Louisiana who owned 65 or more slaves. Among them, C. Richards and her son P. C. Richards owned 152 of their black brethren as slaves to work their sugarcane plantation. A similarly impressive Louisiana free Negro named Antoine Dubuclet owned in excess of 100 dark-skinned black slaves. He was also in the sugar business and boasted an estate that was estimated to be worth (in 1860 dollars) \$264,000 [12]. To put Dubuclet's wealth in context, the mean calculation of wealth for Southern white men at the time averaged \$3978 [13].

Charleston, South Carolina, is yet known for a substantial number of resident light-skinned African-Americans. In 1860, 125 such free Negroes owned slaves; six of them reportedly owned 10 or more. Such light-skinned Negroes, as they were called, owned \$1.5 million in taxable property with more than \$300,000 in the form of slave holdings [14]. But among their number, William Ellison is prominent for both his wealth and the cruelty toward his black slaves, for which he was known among both Southern blacks and whites. Historians for whatever reasons have attempted to justify his version of victim-group discrimination perhaps as a matter of political correctness.

In *Black Masters: A Free Family of Color in the Old South*, authors Michael P. Johnson and James L. Roark provide an account of William Ellison, South Carolina's largest owner of black slaves in 1860. Ellison was born a slave himself, but by the time of his death, at age 71, he was no doubt a magnate slave master. At birth, William Ellison was named April following slave tradition: A common practice among slaves was to name a newborn for the day or month of their birth. Sometime between 1800 and 1802, April was bought by a white master, named William Ellison, from whom he took his new name. April/Ellison proved to be a very bright and industrious young man. Thus, beginning at age 12, he was instructed in the trades of carpentry, blacksmithing, and machining. He was also taught how to read, write, and cipher and he managed some basics in bookkeeping.

Ellison's white owner sought to free him on June 8, 1816. Such an act required the white master William Ellison to appear before a magistrate, accompanied by

five witnesses for the purpose of officially freeing the black slave William Ellison who was 26 years of age. Freeing a slave was taken to be a serious matter. Thus, in 1800, South Carolina prescribed detailed procedures for the act. Such procedures were adopted to assure that only those blacks worthy and of good character would be freed. To assure that a slave would not become a financial burden upon the state, they were also required to produce evidence of their ability to sustain an honest livelihood once they were on their own.

After Ellison gained his freedom, he relocated to where he would begin accumulation of his wealth. One of his first ventures required that he hire black slaves to help with his building projects business. Records show that in 1817 he paid Judge Thomas Watries for assistance by the Judge's slave in building a gin. Before long, Ellison had purchased his own slaves to assist him at work [11]. Curiously Ellison, a black man, demonstrated that he was not the least concerned about the institution of slavery and never questioned it on moral or ethical grounds, perhaps because it brought him more wealth than most whites of the time could acquire. The fact of his victim-group discrimination was thus irrelevant.

Ellison was required on June 20, 1820, to appear in the Sumter District courthouse, located in Sumterville, South Carolina. The fact that he was a light-skinned African-American is suggested in official court documents, being described as a "freed yellow man of about 29 years of age." The court hearing involved an official name change for Ellison and his children—from April, his birth name—to Ellison, for purposes of respect and to extend gratitude to his former white master. Ellison's victim-group discrimination mentality was the sincerest form of domination imaginable, making him no less culpable than whites for the cruelty of slavery. In his own way, Ellison enabled white supremacy in his apathy for black suffering and later choosing to become the black member of a predominantly white Episcopalian church when the black church was the mainstay of the black community. In time, the white church allowed Ellison to sit on the first floor among wealthy whites while blacks and poor whites were required to sit in the balcony.

The bulk of Ellison's fortune was made between 1822 and the mid-1840s, which allowed him to purchase a large number of slaves. His primary source of income was the building of cotton gin machines, which he sold in places as far away as Mississippi. He advertised for business in newspapers, including the *Camden Gazette*, the *Sumter Southern Whig*, and the *Black River Watchman*. By using slave labor to build his gins, Ellison forced many of his white competitors out of business. According to Ervin Jordan:

Free Afro-Virginians were a nascent black middle class under siege, but several acquired property before and during the war. Approximately 169 free blacks owned 145,976 acres in the counties of Amelia, Amherst, Isle of Wight, Nansemond, Prince William and Surry, averaging 870 acres each. Twenty-nine Petersburg blacks each owned property worth \$1,000 and continued to purchase more despite the war [11].

As an example, Jordan gives an account of "Gilbert Hunt, a Richmond ex-slave blacksmith, owned two slaves, a house valued at \$1376, and \$500 in other properties at his death in 1863." It goes without saying that few among such blacks were

dark-skinned. Most were likely to be the light-skinned offspring of white masters who had freed them, after which they were provided with education and gifts of property.

Around 1838, the light-skinned, black, slave owner Ellison purchased 54.5 acres on credit over time from a Stephen D. Miller. The property contained a large residence, into which Ellison moved. Of significant note about the property is that it was reportedly owned by Miller, who had served in the South Carolina legislature, the US House of Representatives, the US Senate, and had been governor of the state. By 1847, Ellison had accumulated more than 350 acres, by 1860 more than 900. Aside from raising cotton, he raised his own food to feed both his family and the black slaves he owned. Subsequently, by 1840 Ellison owned 30 slaves, and by 1860 he owned 63. Other members of his family including his sons owned slaves as well [11]. In an effort to maintain the black color line, Ellison's children married light-skinned mulattos from the surrounding area.

Ellison's wealth became so vast, so quickly that he erred in accounting for it. In 1860, he was wealthier than 90% of his white neighbors. In all of South Carolina, only 5% of the population could equal Ellison in real estate. His holdings were 15 times greater than the average holdings for the state's whites. His count of slaves equaled more than 99% of the entire South. Most devastating of all about the light-skinned Ellison was the profits he accumulated as a "slave breeder." Slave breeding was the forcing of black women to bare children for the sole purpose of selling them at birth for profit. Even whites viewed slave breeding as immoral, as most states made it illegal to sell slaves who were younger than 12 years of age. Despite the disdain for slave breeding, in 1840 Ellison began a business in slave breeding that would have disgusted the typical white slave master.

Slavery is made profitable by the labor of black males. However, black women were just as likely to be enslaved but did not have the profit potential of black males. The strength differential between men and women meant that black women were much less productive workers. Subsequently, Ellison kept only a few black women in his slave holdings for breeding purposes and he sold the rest at birth for an average price of \$400. As a leader in the business of slavery, the light-skinned, black Ellison was reputed to be a cruel master. Witnesses described his slaves as the worst fed and clothed in the district. He separated those slaves who protested conditions and incarcerated them in a small, windowless building. A slave who escaped the Ellison plantation for a better life was later sought by Ellison, who hired a white man to hunt for him. That is, a black man owned other black men as slaves and when his slaves escaped, the victim-group black man hired a white man to recapture them for pay. Such was the case of a white man whom Ellison hired, named Robert N. Andrews. After returning a runaway slave to Ellison, Andrews "...was paid on returning home \$77.50 and \$74 for expenses" [11].

When the light-skinned, black Ellison died, his wealth was willed to his surviving light-skinned children. They in turn displayed a continuation of his victim-group discrimination by supporting the Confederacy side of the Civil War. They helped support the Confederate army by postponing their cotton business and raising corn, fodder, bacon, corn shucks, and cotton for purposes of defeating the Union

armies. Their \$5000 in taxes was supplemented by an additional \$9000 invested in Confederate bonds, treasury notes, certificates, and Confederate currency.

The Ellisons contributed much more to the enslavement of black people than money. The younger Ellisons contributed more than farm produce, labor, and money to the Confederate cause. Ellison's oldest grandson, John Wilson Buckner, enlisted in the 1st South Carolina Artillery and served in the company of Captains P. P. Galliard and A. H. Boykin, who were well aware of the fact that Buckner was a black man. Despite the fact that it was illegal by Confederate law for a black man to fight in the Confederate army, Southern whites were willing to make an exception based upon the prestige of the Ellison family and its wealth. On July 12, 1863, the light-skinned, black Buckner was killed fighting for the Confederate South and the maintenance of a lifestyle that relegated black Americans to slavery. His Confederate comrades described him simply as a "faithful soldier" [11].

Historically, light-skinned blacks have represented the black elite. From the perspective of most historians, the number of the light-skinned black elite was quite small. However, in comparison to dark-skinned blacks, the light-skinned black elite lived well as most had descended from white slave masters. Similar to whites, they differentiated themselves as "old family" elite and/or the newcomers. At various times and places, this wealthy class of black people was known as the "colored aristocracy," the "black 400," the "upper tens," and the "best society" [15].

What is most salient about the light-skinned black elite is how they regarded themselves in comparison to both the black and white communities, between which they have existed. They regarded themselves as privileged based upon values, norms, traditions, education, and other characteristics reflective of the white community. They were sure to make reference to the fact that the black community was not a monolith and, while the masses of illiterate, lower-class, dark-skinned blacks were justly regarded as inferior, the light-skinned black elite among them were as civilized and poised as any white person. Poor whites were especially offended by this attitude, referring to them as "uppity blacks" and dark-skinned blacks were given to intense anger over this. They recognized that the effort to improve their lot on the part of the light-skinned, black elite was done at the expense of denigrating less fortunate dark-skinned blacks. In the aftermath of dislike for one another, such blacks often exceeded the dislike on the part of whites for black folk in general, which enabled discrimination against one another.

The light-skinned, black elite communities were evident in the shadows of Southern plantations, where just a few short years prior many had lived and worked. While most whites in the South and elsewhere regarded the whole of black folk as inferior, some did acknowledge existing class distinctions. In 1877, a Southerner employed as a writer for the *Atlantic* magazine made note of an elite class among black South Carolinians who practiced a rigid form of social ranking and skin color discrimination [7]. In daily life, they took painstaking measures to see to it that no lowly, dark-skinned, black person could enter their ranks by marriage, social circumstances, or community affairs. On occasion, any dark-skinned black outsiders who acquired unusual wealth or prestige might be privileged to enter the ranks of

the light-skinned, black elite, but even within such ranks they would be less than equal to the lighter-skinned members.

Whatever the circumstances, it is well known that a discriminating light-skinned black community existed in both small towns and large cities throughout the American South. Another white journalist reported that in the South there were two black elite factions evolving, a cultured aristocracy and an aristocracy of wealth. However, regardless of which faction the black elite might aspire, their status within the community was grounded in their official station in life, their church position, amount of wealth including money or real estate, their previous ownership, and the city where they were born. Additionally, when such criteria were satisfactory the issue of skin color was not irrelevant in overall importance, as a white schoolteacher in Tennessee discovered in the following example [8].

A white teacher, employed in the Negro school district in Memphis, Tennessee, took note of the elaborate class distinctions blacks made of themselves by listening to and observing her black students. She concluded that in their zeal to distinguish differentiations within the group they far exceeded whites of the day. They created a greater number of categories and defended respect for those categories with more enthusiasm than ever would have been expected. At the very height of the black community was the light-skinned aristocracy who had been, more often than not, house Negroes. Even in the smallest of Southern towns, at least one such family could be found among the residents. Membership required a black person to be born into it assuming money, education, and a style of conduct that was fitting of the group. The group sustained itself by marriage, selective of only those who possessed similar qualities—most importantly light skin color. When exceptions were made, education or some extraordinary accomplishment might suffice, but wealth alone would never prove satisfactory. Those lighter in skin color experienced greater leniency in making exceptions compared to those who were darker-skinned or otherwise held a striking resemblance to lowly, despised, dark-skinned field Negroes. Such discriminatory behaviors were an exact model of white supremacy applied toward blacks, internalized and enacted by blacks against one another because it was an American norm. Dark-skinned blacks might act out similar discriminatory behaviors against light-skinned blacks as well, though less often.

Because the majority of Americans in the workplace have been of European descent, victim-group discrimination by African-Americans was no less apparent relative to light skin [3]. This discrimination evolved from miscegenation that took place during the antebellum era [16]. Early on, the light-skinned offspring of the plantation class held a privileged status in the African-American community [17]. Wealth, poise, and overall appeal were associated with their light skin as a natural course of action [10]. This association prevailed in the most public historical exchanges between African-American leaders. In an editorial of the *Crisis*, an Atlanta University journal, as well as the official National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) journal, light-skinned African-American W.E.B. Du Bois labels black leader Marcus Garvey as “fat, black, and ugly,” implying that dark features were unattractive [18]. This was not a singular incident. A high-ranking NAACP official used similar language, referring to Marcus

Garvey as a “Jamaican Negro of unmixed stock” and implying that pronounced African features and dark skin were not the least complimentary [19].

The acceptance of light skin as preferred meant that it became a vehicle for victim-group discrimination, even though light skin among African-Americans was less common than relatively dark skin [20]. Value-laden descriptive terms evolved that reflected this, such as high yellow, ginger, cream colored, and bronze [21]. Similar norms were associated with other features, such as hair, which was designated as bad if it was the kinky, African type and good if it was the straight, Caucasian type. When the term black was used, it more often inferred something derogatory and grist for discrimination [4].

Shortly after Negro Suffrage and the Garvey era, overt verbal hostilities regarding skin color in the black community largely subsided. The preference for light skin, however, remained intact and actually became more accepted over time [21]. On college campuses, it was almost impossible for a dark-skinned coed to join a sorority. Various social events, such as school dances, required the “brown paper bag test” as a condition of their admission: Those with skin being darker than the color of a brown paper bag were discriminated against and were assessed a fee by lighter-skinned blacks before they could be admitted; those with lighter skin were admitted free of charge [22].

Rhetoric of the 1960s espoused healthier norms in the African-American community [22]. Kinky hair and dark features were heralded as desirable on the college campus and in marriage. In retrospect, however, what was practiced did not always coincide with what was espoused. Dark-skinned black coeds could join clubs and sororities, but there did not appear to be any real progress in the ability of such persons to overcome the preference for light skin. Still, the issue of light skin was seldom discussed among them publicly given the embarrassment that such discriminatory behaviors might cause.

The 1964 Civil Rights act was a failed attempt to redress racial discrimination. To compensate, a number of laws and policies were enacted to enable more opportunities for dark-skinned victim-group populations [23]. But many of the laws may today be passively enforced by conservative political administrations. Critics contend that they violate equal protection and set up a process of reverse discrimination [24]. They further suggest that such laws may also benefit minorities and women who are not victims of discrimination and, because of hiring practices, punish white males who are “innocent” of any wrongdoing. Such assumptions are naive and reflect the spoils of power. While true to some extent, the same critics ignore the complex web of issues met by victim groups, which are not only irrelevant to innocent white males but in some cases create an advantage [25]. The fact that discrimination is so pervasive in America is reflected in those being the most discriminated against are dark-skinned and respond similarly to the light-skinned in challenging their acceptance into the ethnic fold, accusing them of passing for white; passing is when a person of light skin tone blends into white society and is not perceived as black.

Among the noted cases of blacks discriminating against light-skinned blacks was that of Mary Walker. Most tend to think that passing for white is an outdated concept

relevant only to a distant and ugly past, when black Americans could be lynched with no outcry from the public; Ms. Walker's case dispels that notion. She grew up during the 1960s, at the height of the black pride movement, but was raised in an all-white neighborhood in Denver, Colorado. Her parents—who were both black—required Mary and her 12 siblings to pass as white from birth. According to Ms. Walker, her parents believed that life would be better for them if they did not reveal that they were black. The whole family thus had to guard their secret very carefully: The children were reprimanded if they didn't straighten their hair on schedule or if they used black slang.

Mary Walker was not particularly bothered by these restrictions until she went to a small college in the Western United States, where cultural norms made her an outcast among blacks when she tried to join the Black Student Union on campus. She was told that she was "too white": a form of victim-group discrimination. It was then that she realized that her parents' enforcement of white norms had cost her a major part of her identity. Having no idea what to do about the problem, she decided to ignore it and put her energies into getting her degree.

After graduation, Walker continued to pass for white until she was in her 30s, when she decided to advocate the hiring of more black teachers at the school where she was employed. In so doing, she "came out of the closet" about her own passing for white. Not too surprisingly, the school administration then accused her of trying to take advantage of Affirmative Action policies by suddenly declaring herself to be black when she obviously was not. She claims to have been fired from her job as a result, an ironic form of victim-group discrimination that generated media interest in her story [26]. While dark-skinned blacks do not possess the physical attributes to pass, they are no less given to victim-group discrimination in criticizing the entirety of the black community, including family members. The life of Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas provides a glaring example.

One of the most well-known, dark-skinned African-Americans is Justice Clarence Thomas. Justice Thomas is by birth a Southerner, raised at a time when dignity and self-respect were an illusion to black folk. Initially, Thomas aspired to become a member of the clergy in an effort to please his rigid grandfather, whose authoritarian manner may have predisposed Thomas to discriminate, as psychologists contend. Like many black Americans, his life story of struggle is nothing unique. In fact, under the circumstances his life is quite common. That is, most any black American who is fortunate enough to experience some measure of success in life can attribute it to family members who had less. For many, there is a Clarence Thomas grandfather who, while he could not succeed himself, found his success in the next generation. They are often rigid and unyielding, convinced—by stereotype and the white perspective—that blacks who fail do so by their own means. Thus, black conservatives, having internalized white norms, insist that blacks if they want can succeed by their own means. The role of racism regarding victim-group discrimination is irrelevant from their perspective.

A brief investigation of Justice Thomas's life will reveal little doubt about the internalized self-hate based on skin color that has preceded his tendencies to become a conservative black. That self-hate is a product of a history of destructive images,

portraying him personally, his family, his community, and his worth as a human being. It is a psychological consequence blacks have had to pay for the progress some have made, particularly in recent generations. Some may applaud Thomas's success and white conservatives in particular insist that Thomas is a primary example of what all worthy black folk should aspire to in order to improve their lot. Unfortunately, there are other aspects of Justice Thomas pertaining to his psyche that supporters are less likely to comment on publicly. Such aspects reveal a black man who has been damaged by the destructive black images that have been internalized since childhood. Enabled by the influence of an authoritarian dictatorial grandfather, which psychologists contend would predispose him to discriminate, Thomas presents a classic example of black self-hate. Not only does this pertain to the way he regards black people but members of his own family as well. Even black conservatives have acknowledged the shortcomings of Thomas's life, notably Shelby Steele. Steele acknowledges Thomas' problematic psyche as "integration shock." According to Steele, evidence of integration shock is manifested as "intense feelings of racial inferiority and self-doubt" on the part of successful black Americans. Similar to culture shock, such blacks are thrust into an all-white world where they do not have the cultural skills to survive and are subjected to overt hostilities as well. Evidence of the resulting self-hate has been investigated extensively in the scholarly literature.

Shelby Steele is not alone in his assessment of Justice Thomas's self-hate psyche. Psychiatrists have long known of the prevailing impact that a racist society has upon the black conservative. Each victim may respond differently. Symptomologies may range from an angry denial of white discrimination, as is the case with most black conservatives, to an emotional attachment to whites as the rigid father with whom they identify, also indicative of the black conservative.

Justice Thomas grew up in the 1950s. Due to having dark skin color, he was ridiculed by friends as "A.B.C." an acronym meaning America's Blackest Child. Both black and white children in his Southern Georgia town referred to him by such a name. In the 1950s, prior to the "black is beautiful" movement, A.B.C. was the cruelest of names a black child could have. In addition, as the only black student enrolled in a Southern Catholic boarding school, Thomas was the daily butt of untold racist insults. Whites were known to hurl verbal insults at Thomas for all to hear: "'Smile, Clarence, so we can see you,' a white classmate yelled after lights out" [27]. Thomas himself has admitted to a period of self-hate in his life, which as a black conservative he projected onto other blacks as evidence of victim-group discrimination. When submission to whites failed, he assumed there was nothing he could do to earn their respect. However, vis-à-vis skin color, Thomas found little sympathy in the black community and experienced other manifestations of ridicule on a daily basis.

Although Justice Thomas did not initially admit to self-hate during his youth, his attempts to separate himself from black people are obvious in his social life, education, and most importantly conservative political views. While enrolled at Yale law school, Thomas made every effort to avoid law classes on civil rights issues. Like Mary Walker, who passed to cut herself off from the black community, Thomas

found other ways to affectively do the same. He chose classes more likely of interest to whites including corporate classes. Following graduation Thomas resented offers from firms that did work for black or other good causes. He eventually accepted a position in the Missouri state attorney general's office. There he saw few blacks as he handled revenue and tax litigation. Soon after came a call from the Reagan White House, wanting to assign Thomas to the Department of Education, as Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights. In that position, his self-hate evidenced by discrimination against blacks became a matter of public record. He insisted that blacks who accepted welfare were engaging in little more than a "sugar-coated form of slavery" [27].

Thomas's black conservative friends think of him as a well-adjusted black man who displays self-esteem and a keen intellect. They do not see his conservative politics as an opportunity to profit at the expense of black folk nor do they see him as an "Uncle Tom," as others contend. However, contrary to their views, Thomas has exemplified his self-hate and hatred of black people in his denigration of members of his own family.

In 1980, Justice Thomas attended a meeting of black conservatives in San Francisco, California. During that meeting, he publicly referred to his sister, Emma Martin, as an example of the outcome for blacks who depend upon Liberal programs such as welfare:

"She gets mad when the mailman is late with her welfare check, that's how dependent she is," said Thomas. "What is worse is that now her kids feel entitled to the check too. They have no motivation for doing better or getting out of that situation" [27].

In fact, as is frequently the black conservative *modus operandi*, Thomas's version of his sister's situation is a creative representation of details. At the time of the San Francisco meeting, his sister was not on welfare but working double shifts at a nursing home for little more than \$2 per hour. At various times in her life, she had relied on welfare as when she left an abusive marriage and then to care for an ailing family member. While on welfare at the time, Thomas's sister maintained part-time employment picking crabmeat at a factory near her residence. At some point, to leave welfare Thomas's sister obtained two low-paying jobs to support herself. After learning of her public denigration by her brother, Thomas's sister refused to respond, suggesting that unlike her dark-skinned brother the societal pressure to discriminate had not overcome her [27].

Evidence of black victim-group discrimination is unlimited for anyone who cares to investigate. For social scientists, the quality of that evidence is of significant importance. Their access to litigation pertaining to victim-group discrimination enables their conclusions to withstand the most rigorous tests of validity. While such discrimination has existed for decades, the first known case to reach litigation was that of Walker versus the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), which took place in Atlanta Federal District Court in 1989.

The plaintiff, Ms. Tracy Walker, was a permanent clerk typist in the Atlanta IRS office. She is a light-skinned, African American female. Her supervisor—employee of the defendant—is Ms. Ruby Lewis, a dark-skinned, African-American female.

The employees in the office in which the plaintiff and the defendant worked were predominantly African-American. In fact, following her termination, Walker was replaced by an African-American. According to the record, the working relationship between the plaintiff and the defendant was strained from the very beginning—that is, since approximately November 1985. The plaintiff contends that the defendant singled her out for close scrutiny and reprimanded her for many things that were false or unsubstantial. The plaintiff's relationship with her former supervisor, a white female named Virginia Fite, was cordial. In fact, the plaintiff received a favorable recommendation from Fite. In taking action, the plaintiff met with Sidney Douglas, the Equal Opportunity Employment Commission (EEOC) program manager for the IRS Atlanta district about the problems she was having with the defendant. Two weeks later, pursuant to the defendant's recommendation, the plaintiff was terminated. The reasons given for termination are (a) tardiness, (b) laziness, (c) incompetence, and (d) attitude problems. It was the plaintiff's belief that the reasons were fabricated and were the result of the defendant's personal hostility toward the plaintiff because of the plaintiff's light skin. The plaintiff did not present any direct evidence that the defendant was prejudiced against light-skinned African-Americans. There was, however, evidence that the defendant might have harbored resentful feelings toward white people and, by inference, possibly toward light-skinned African-Americans, being indicative of victim-group discrimination.

The plaintiff maintained that she was treated unfairly prior to her termination for no apparent reason. She would have the court find that the unfair treatment was due to the defendant's prejudice against her light skin color. Following her termination the plaintiff filed a lawsuit pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The plaintiff alleges she was terminated because of invidious discrimination on the part of her supervisor and that her termination constituted retaliation due to her complaining to the EEOC. Given that this was a Title VII action, the case was initially heard before a magistrate. The magistrate recommended granting the defendant's summary judgment motion with respect to the claims under the Administrative Procedure Act. The magistrate recommended granting the portion of the defendant's summary judgment motion that dealt with the Title VII invidious discrimination claim. The magistrate recommended denying the defendant's summary judgment motion with respect to the retaliation claim.

In sum, the federal court found that a portion of the magistrate's recommendation that granted the defendant's motion for summary judgment with respect to plaintiff's 1981 claim, plaintiff's 1983 claim, and plaintiff's Administrative Procedure Act claim was unsubstantiated. The court also adopted the portion of the magistrate's recommendation that denied the defendant's motion for summary judgment with respect to plaintiff's Title VII retaliation claim. Following expert testimony by myself, the federal court set aside the portion of the magistrate's recommendation that granted defendant's summary judgment motion with respect to plaintiff's Title VII discrimination claim (*Morrow vs IRS*, 1990).

While the aforementioned discrimination litigation brought by African-Americans has received limited attention in the scholarly and journalistic literature, it continues up to the present date. *Porter versus the State of Illinois* is one such

case, litigated in 1997 in the US District Court, Northern District of Illinois East Division. Porter, the light-skinned, African-American male plaintiff, cites the States' statement as direct evidence that race via skin color was a motivating factor in his termination. The plaintiff states in his affidavit:

During one of my first meetings with Marcia Williams (dark-skinned, female, defendant employee) soon after she became my supervisor, she told me that she did not like light-skinned African American men and that she was going to get rid of me before my probationary period was over [29].

Although the defendant denies that this conversation occurred, she acknowledges that she prefers dark-skinned, African-American men as social partners or mates. She also admits that she discussed this with her friends, but she did not recall whether she also shared that information with the plaintiff. The defendant contended that this evidence is immaterial because the record does not reveal any causal link between her statement and plaintiff's subsequent termination.

The parties do not dispute that the defendant lacked authority to discharge the plaintiff or even to make recommendations. As a matter of state law, final disciplinary authority was vested in the Director of the Illinois Department of Central Management Services. But there was also evidence that the defendant played a significant role in the decision to fire the plaintiff. As the plaintiff's immediate supervisor, the defendant monitored his work and prepared the negative evaluation of November 1994. She initiated the charges that led to both of his predisciplinary meetings, and she conversed with the appropriate administrators who decided whether or not to recommend discipline. Although the record did not reveal the extent to which the final decision-making authorities actually relied on the charges formulated by defendant, it contained sufficient evidence to raise a factual question about whether she had a significant hand in their decision.

The possibility that the defendant played a significant role in the plaintiff's termination did not imply that her alleged bias was a material factor in that discharge. The plaintiff sought to forge this causal relationship by suggesting that racial animus led defendant to reject his work—thus saddling him with an artificially inflated caseload—or to invent the charges against him.

The plaintiff offered no specific evidence to rebut the charges that formed the basis of his discharge. Nor did he cite any evidence other than his own word to show that his work was comparable to that of his colleagues, who were not disciplined or discharged. The fact that the plaintiff failed to meet his deadlines even after his supervisors reassigned his pending cases and reduced his case intake suggested that he would have been unable to do his job even if the defendant had not returned his work. Standing alone, the plaintiff's own testimony about the quality of his job performance did not discredit the evaluation of his work as offered by his employer. Accordingly, the court found that the defendant's statement bore no material relationship to the plaintiff's termination and was not direct evidence of intentional skin color discrimination.

Thus, according to the court, the defendant presented virtually overwhelming evidence that the plaintiff was not performing his job adequately when he was discharged. Rather than produce any specific evidence to rebut the charges, the plaintiff

relied primarily on his own self-serving testimony to show that his work was adequate. Accordingly, the court found that the record contained insufficient evidence to raise an inference that the plaintiff was fired because of his age, race, or complexion in violation of Title VII, or the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment [29]. As a result, the defendant's motion for summary judgment was granted.

In the same year, same District Court, and same state as the Porter case, plaintiff Lamont Sullivan, an African-American male, was employed from February 1995 until July 1996 as a "supervisor of reel assembly" at a Presstronics facility in Aurora, Illinois. His charge of discrimination included a Latino-American whom he claims benefited. In July 1996, Sullivan was laid off by Presstronics, ostensibly due to a lack of work at the company. The plaintiff attempted to regain his position in late July, but was informed that he had been laid off indefinitely and that his employment with the company was therefore terminated. Despite the company's representations that the plaintiff's termination was motivated by lack of work, Presstronics had hired less experienced white and Latino-American workers to do the job Sullivan had previously done. While the plaintiff did not refer to skin color directly as basis of alleged discrimination, the association of Latino with "white" is strong evidence of that assumption. However, the plaintiff failed to prove his case. For that reason, a motion to dismiss was granted by the court [30].

With the aforementioned cases, skin color is compulsory to discrimination litigation among victim-group populations, which extends from black slave ownership and the antebellum era [31]. Most documented accounts of such discrimination among blacks pertain to charges brought by dark-skinned blacks against light-skinned blacks. However, the fact of charges brought by light-skinned blacks who suffer discrimination from dark-skinned blacks attests to the universality of the pathology. It substantiates blacks' simultaneous status as victims and perpetrators of racism, that is, victimism. As with the black/white dichotomy, the former is contingent upon having dark skin; the latter is a psychological residue of European colonization and domination [5]. It thus logically follows that trends in racial diversity today, augmented by increased levels of miscegenation, accommodate a view that America is no longer a homogeneous society and that discrimination is no longer the exclusive domain of whites. As a result, the black/white dichotomy has become less relevant. This does not negate the pervasiveness of Euro-American racism and discrimination, but allows for amplified analysis to include the role engaged by all—including victim-group people of color. Acknowledgement through scholarly literature that is relative to racism and/or discrimination among victim-group populations will benefit society by contributing to the erudition required for its eventual elimination.

References

1. Pierce, C. M. (1978). Entitlement dysfunctions. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 12, 215–219.
2. Hamilton, C. (1989). Work and welfare: how industrialists shaped government social services during the progressive era. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 16(2), 67–86.

3. Myrdal, G. (1944). *An American dilemma*. New York: Harper & Row.
4. Rose, A. (1964). *The Negro in America*. New York: Harper & Row.
5. Welsing, F. (1970). *The cress theory of color confrontation and racism*. Washington, DC: C-R Publishers.
6. Jones, B. F. (1966). James Baldwin: the struggle for identity. *British Journal of Sociology*, 17, 107–121.
7. Hall, R. (1995). Dark skin and the cultural ideal of masculinity. *Journal of African American Men*, 1(3), 37–62.
8. Vontress, C. (1970). Counseling blacks. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 48, 713–719.
9. Huggins, N. (1942). *Key issues in the Afro-American experience*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
10. Reuter, E. (1969). *The mulatto in the United States*. New York: Haskell House.
11. Grooms, R. (1997). Dixie's censored subject: black slaveowners. http://americancivilwar.com/authors/black_slaveowners.htm. Accessed 14 June 2009.
12. Mills, G. (1977). *The forgotten people: Cane River's Creoles of color*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
13. Soltow, L. (1975). *Male inheritance expectations in the United States in 1870* (p. 85). New Haven: Yale University Press.
14. Soltow, L. (1975). *Male inheritance expectations in the United States in 1870* (p. 280). New Haven: Yale University Press.
15. Gatewood, W. B. (1990). *Aristocrats of color*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
16. Fanon, F. (1965). *Black skin, white masks*. New York: Grove.
17. Klineberg, O. (1944). *Characteristics of the American Negro*. New York: Harper & Row.
18. Franklin, J. H., & Meier, A. (1982). *Black leaders of the twentieth century*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
19. Garvey, A. J. (1986). *Garvey and Garveyism*. New York: Octagon.
20. Herskovits, M. (1968). *The American Negro*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
21. Hall, R. E. (1990). The projected manifestations of aspiration, personal values, and environmental assessment cognates of cutaneo-chroma (skin color) for a selected population of African Americans (Doctoral dissertation, Atlanta University, 1989). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 50, 3363A.
22. Jones, R. L. (Ed.). (1980). *Black pride in the seventies*. New York: Harper & Row.
23. Karger, H. J., & Stoesz, D. (1990). *American social welfare policy*. New York: Longman.
24. O'Neill, T. (1985). *Bakke and the politics of equality*. Scranton, PA: Wesleyan University Press.
25. Hiskey, M. (1990, February 1). Boss: skin hue, firing unrelated. *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, 1, 4.
26. Hall, R. (2005). *An empirical analysis of the impact of skin color on African-American education, income, and occupation*. Lewiston, NY: Mellen Press.
27. White, J., Ludtke, M., & Winbush, D. (1991, September 16). The pain of being black. *Time*.
28. *Morrow v. Internal Revenue Service*, 742 F Supp. 670 (N.D. Ga. 1990).
29. *Porter v. State of Illinois*, 987 F Supp. 667 (U.S. Dist. Ill. 1997).
30. *Sullivan v. Presstronics*, 96 C, Supp. 7436 (U.S. Dist. Ill. 1997).
31. Hall, R. (1992). Bias among African Americans regarding skin color: implications for social work practice. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 2(4), 479–486.

Chapter 5

Asian-Americans: The Historical Implications of Light Skin

Given the racial and ethnic shifts in contemporary Western cultures, scholars face an unprecedented challenge to keep pace with the implications of such shifts for victim-group discrimination. The migration of Asian ethnic populations to the United States has created the need for a new and more inclusive perspective pertaining to discrimination. Of particular concern in the study of victim-group discrimination is the need to understand the impact of assimilation of Asian-Americans into a racist dominant-group society such as the United States, and how the influences of skin color are enacted as discrimination, by Asian-Americans against other victim-group populations. For some, discrimination in the United States is served by the traditions of their native culture. Heretofore little investigated, a study of the growing number of Asian populations will be better illustrated and allow for a more comprehensive examination of victimism as a twenty-first-century sociological fact.

In the analysis of Asian-Americans who are inclined to victim-group discrimination, no one is more esteemed than Dr. Harry L. Kitano. Kitano, an Asian-American professor emeritus of Social Work, is too little known for his scientific research, which has provided insight into critical Asian issues. According to Kitano, Asian-Americans face the prospects of assimilation taking place by way of a process he calls the “domination model.” The domination model encourages victim-group discrimination by Asian-Americans dominated by white preferences, who might otherwise not take part. But for assimilation into a racist mainstream society, they submit to the influence of quality-of-life aspirations and internalized Western norms. Kitano’s book, *Race Relations*, explains the concept of domination assimilation in more detail. Simply put, he suggests that the domination model would mean that assimilation is a dictated process whereby a powerful group—in this case Caucasian Americans—withholds or bestows societal reward on the basis of what it values in its people [1]. In a society that turns on the wheels of competition, assimilation for those who are not valued by society can be a painful process. And for those who cannot or will not compete for whatever reasons, opportunity and quality of life will be negatively impacted. Thus, given that light skin is highly valued in America, and is the basis of racial discrimination by skin color, Asian-Americans as a victim-group population are at a decided disadvantage in most matters of competition with mainstream white Americans. They cannot compete—at least to an equal extent—because they lack the necessary criteria for mainstream assimilation. And,

unfortunately, Asians who migrate to the West do not have a choice because dark, alien skin and Asian eye shape is not an advantage. Yet embracing Western culture in America has been a tradition historically for successful assimilation or acceptance of migrant groups into the mainstream of society, one not irrelevant to acting out victim-group discrimination. That is, any migrant group wishing to become assimilated into the American mainstream must be willing to embrace it in its entirety or risk being further alienated from the powerful mainstream population. In response, the alternative display of victim-group discrimination by Asian-Americans is dramatically enacted in their historical response to the differentiations between light and dark skin color.

Asia, as defined in the West, includes the Indian subcontinent eastward to the Philippines, north to China, and south to Indonesia. Absent European influences, it would appear that there is nothing particularly atypical about skin color to most of the Asians who reside in these areas. However, according to Australian diplomat Cavan Hogue, the most dramatic implications of skin color exists in the attitudes of northern Asians including Chinese, Japanese, and Koreans [2]. All three peoples have a significant degree of racial homogeneity within the native population. Arguably, it is among the Japanese that exists the strongest evidence of denigrating dark-skinned people. Furthermore, the Japanese have historically maintained myths that rationalize the superiority of Japanese people, not necessarily motivated by racism per se but more as an aspect of cultural norm.

The history of Asian-American experiences with discrimination, and the denigration of people characterized by dark skin, reaches back to their homeland Aryans—circa 1500–500 B.C. The Aryans were a people regarded as “uncivilized” but, in fact, who were superior warriors. Over several centuries, they conquered the indigenous Asian folk and took their lands. By the late Vedic period, 1000–500 B.C., Aryans had merged their blood with their Asian subjects and were in complete control [3]. Several centuries later, Asians were visited once again by the conquerors from Great Britain. Similar to Aryans in skin color, the lighter-skinned British, no doubt, left an indelible impression upon the Asian psyche. Furthermore, their ancestors had made contact with the West prior to the mid-nineteenth-century immigration. Pottery and other archaeological finds suggest the Japanese visited Ecuador and Peru around 3000 B.C. [4]. Evidence exists of Chinese settlements in Mexico, dating to the Ming Dynasty [4]. Chinese sailors manned American ships during the 1800s and established a colony, however short lived, in the New World. In fact, the first US consul to serve external to its borders was Samuel Shaw, assigned to Canton.

Among Asian-Americans, Japanese citizens like their mother countrymen felt disdain for dark skin and a preference for light skin, long before any significant contacts with Europeans, because the notion is rooted in their culture [5]. While most had never encountered Africans personally, they felt them to be culturally inferior and the women to be less than beautiful. Thus, the Japanese thought of light skin as the ideal of feminine beauty and dark skin as ugly. Their response to the light skin of Europeans and the dark skin of Africans was a historical norm and intimately woven into Japanese beauty standards, eventually exacerbated by the influences of Western

colonization. Skin color as far as the Japanese are concerned is a sign of refinement or barbarity. Perhaps for this reason they refer to their skin color as *shiroi*, which translates as “white” [5].

In Japan, white and/or light skin has long been an essential trait of feminine beauty. A Japanese proverb says, “white skin makes up for seven defects” of a woman [5]. For those who are light-skinned, the light skin will allow defects to be ignored. Under the auspices of cultural influences and similar to Africans who bleach, historically many Japanese women took advantage of concoctions to give their skin a light appearance. Around the Nara period (A.D. 710–793), ladies of Japanese royalty did not hesitate to apply white powder to their faces [5]. They also colored their cheeks in the form of red so-called beauty spots, applied between the eyebrows and the exterior corners of their eyes and lips [5].

When the West emerged as an imperial power, Asians revisited the Americas under different circumstances. While they dispersed to Europe and South America, the largest numbers to arrive in the United States were Chinese, during the gold rush of 1849. Others such as Japanese, Koreans, and Filipinos arrived some 40–60 years later seeking a better life. Their journey was not originally intended as permanent but only for a limited work engagement. The view of America as a temporary overseas job opportunity was reinforced by the overt discrimination and racism perpetrated against Asians and other foreigners. The inability to assimilate into the mainstream led early Asian-American immigrants to form subsocieties. Their conspicuous soma-type limited opportunities and ultimately quality of life as stigmatized aliens.

The Chinese encountered Western racism immediately upon arrival in America, despite the overwhelming need for manual railroad labor. Much like African-Americans, they were denied all manner of civil rights and were occasionally murdered. Following the Civil War, anti-Chinese tensions increased, culminating in the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882. The prevailing social problem most associated with Asian immigrants, such as the Chinese, was a shortage of women, which intensified the potential for discrimination. It ultimately became the grounds for racist complaints pertaining to prostitution and/or miscegenation. In an effort to circumvent friction with the Euro-American community, brothels were set up in Chinatowns and the Chinese were then condemned for resorting to prostitutes [4]. Filipinos, mostly male, were also affected by the shortage of women. Whether or not Asians patronized prostitutes or white women, racists expressed moral indignation, reinforcing Asian alienation. In the aftermath, 14 states passed legislation against miscegenation to bar Asian-Americans from intermarriage with members of the Euro-American population [4].

While Asians were the victims of discrimination, some were no less given to such acts than Euro-Americans toward dark-skinned people, but for different reasons. Thus, as with Japan, their world is composed of the Japanese and their assumed inferior, foreign counterparts—referred to as *ghigin*. It should come as little surprise that this belief would be relevant to Japan’s denigration of non-Japanese—particularly against dark-skinned African-Americans. They were also no less arrogant and brutal than the West in their management of colonial subjects, on the basis of cultural

superiority [6]. That superiority is manifested in a strong sense of hierarchy, which Japanese apply on the basis of ranking those who are darkest at the very bottom. The same system was applied to Korean citizens of Japan, who are among that nation's minority groups. What is more, in *The Rape of Nanking*, author Iris Chang [7] refers to the cruelty and brutality of the Japanese toward the Chinese during their colonial occupation. Her account of Japanese racism is ironic, given that at the time the Chinese all but supported the brutal regime of the light-skinned Nazis. However, the Japanese and the Chinese are not so different in their regard for dark-skinned people. Like the Japanese, Chinese have historically regarded themselves superior, separate, and apart from the rest of mankind. Any non-Chinese are considered barbarians who would welcome the opportunity to stain the professed purity of Chinese blood. As a result, when Chinese students traveled abroad to be educated, they were often warned by their elders not to return married to a "red-haired devil," not perceived as human [2]. So-called red-haired devils included Euro-Americans who treated westward migrating Asians similarly. Those from Africa occupied a rank so far below Western devils as not to even be considered worthy of Chinese denigration. This was apparent in a 1988 rock-throwing incident by hundreds of Chinese students who descended unprovoked upon visiting African students who were studying in China [8].

In the interest of objectivity, the issue of skin color discrimination in China is much more complex than the Western version. China did in fact assimilate Mongolian and Manchu invaders whom they regarded as barbaric. Furthermore, China also absorbed a population of minorities making the issue of skin color and superiority in many ways confusing to non-Chinese observers. In their logic, to be superior is to be pure Chinese, which would create great difficulty for any foreigner. In contrast, Chinese today living offshore in such places as Hong Kong are less concerned about purity as they participate actively in exogamy. Similarly, in Western countries, such as Australia, Chinese engage in exogamy (marrying outside the culture or tribe) more than any other migrant group—but not with dark-skinned people [2].

The remaining Asians consist of Koreans, who retain a sense of superiority equal to that of the Japanese and Chinese. According to a survey conducted by *The Far Eastern Economic Review*, Koreans lead all groups in rejecting non-Asians as inferior, in consideration in matrimony. Subjects were asked whether their child could marry a foreigner with their blessing. Results indicated that only 30% of Koreans were amenable, compared with 95% of Western Australians and 84% of Filipinos. As might be expected among northern Asians, biracial offspring are subjected to severe forms of discrimination, and in Korea, non-Korean spouses are ostracized. Most significantly, the Chinese minority in Korea has been subjected to denigration and prejudice equal to that of the Korean minority in Japan, making for the most noteworthy accommodation of discrimination among victim-group populations [2].

Characteristic of Asian history, Asians who settled in the United States evolved in a Western world convinced of their superiority, but one that had been conquered and/or dominated by Western imperials. Intensified by fantasies of superiority, it is clear that the light skin color of their conquerors became the most critical of traits

by which Asian-Americans assessed humanity relative to discrimination. While the study of discrimination tends to focus on Euro-Americans, where the implications of skin color can be observed in some of its most racist forms, the Asian version is of a different origin. Western imperial domination exacerbated by an inherent sense of superiority necessitated Asian denigration of people by dark skin [9]. Furthermore, since skin color implies the characteristics of a person, rather than the person himself, its use accommodates an emotional reaction to an otherwise benign physiological trait. Its existence, couched in racism, and given the esteem of Western civilization, has resulted in skin color ideals evident in Asian traditions.

In many Asian languages, the words “fair” and “beautiful” are often used synonymously [10]. Asian folk literature places a high value on light skin. For example, the ideal bride, whose beauty and virtue are praised in the songs sung at weddings, almost always has a light complexion. An Asian girl who is dark-skinned is often a problem for her family because of the difficulty of arranging a marriage for her. Marriages among educated Asians are sometimes arranged through advertisements in newspapers; even a casual examination of the matrimonial columns of popular dailies such as *The Hindu* shows that virginity and a light skin color are among the most desirable qualities that prospective grooms and their families look for in a young bride, especially the middle class [10]. In a society where purity of descent is associated with a wide diversity of physical types, these features may be in short supply. Those who do not correspond to the ideal must be accommodated. Among some Asian-Americans then, a dark-skinned girl has a low value in the marriage market. But, at the same time, a dark-skinned girl may be preferred by her local group. Wherever physical differences cut across caste lines in India, for example—and they frequently do—the cultural skin color factor can carry great weight. That is sure to confuse outsiders. And while there is clearly a preference for light skin in almost all Asian populations, it is sometimes difficult to say exactly what the social implications are. The best evidence is to be found in the choice of marriage partners. The choice of a light-skinned bride or groom must, however, be made within limits that are strictly defined by considerations of other kinds such as culture, group, and locale. Thus, in certain parts of North India, Muslim women are very light-skinned and have features that are positively valued. However, this does not seem to negate the fact that a Muslim bride, if light-skinned, would not normally be acceptable in a Hindu household. Thus, skin color of a particular kind is important to Indian Asians contemplating marriage, but other characteristics are not irrelevant [10].

Light skin has much greater weight in choosing a bride than a groom. In the case of the groom, qualities such as wealth, occupation, and education may play an equally significant role. Skin color is important but is secondary. To marry off a dark-skinned son is not so much of a problem in either case for a middle-class family, for he can more easily acquire other socially desirable traits unlike color, which is set at birth [10].

The overlap of Indian racial groups means that skin color and physical types vary significantly. This is true for body type and nasal shape as well as other physical characteristics. The best way to describe these types is not by distinct categories, as a scientist would be tempted to do, but rather on a continuum. To do otherwise

would result in an unnecessarily huge number of meaningless types that would confuse much more than it would explain. Thus, given the close parallels between the Indian Asian caste system and Western skin color discrimination, some similarities are readily apparent. A study conducted by Kingsley Davis makes a distinction between what he calls “racial” and “nonracial” castes [11]. For example, the Hindu, nonracial caste system is bound purely by descent and socio-economics. The racial caste system, on the other hand, is bound by skin color in relation to wealth and class. Consequently, a dark-skinned son will not be perceived as a liability to a middle-class family as would a dark-skinned daughter: A son may compensate by acquiring other socially desirable status traits [11]. Suffice it to say that Davis rejects the idea that race itself has very much to do with caste in India today.

Other researchers have attempted approaches that are more scientific regarding implications of skin color and caste on victim-group discrimination in India. According to Sir Herbert Risley, who did an early census study for India, the caste system provides a unique opportunity to differentiate between certain physical types. His work concludes that there was a close correlation between skin color and the rank order of caste [11]. It is also his position that the rank of a particular caste varies inversely with the average nasal index of its members. In other words, those who belonged to upper castes have narrower noses—Caucasian—while those of the lower castes have broader noses—Negroid.

At first glance, to the untrained eye, Risley’s findings would appear too general and simplistic to associate with skin color. Anyone who has observed the Indian Asian population in America can point to numerous exceptions between the skin color and nasal shape of Indian people. It is simply much too complex to draw conclusions about a people without the benefit of cultural experience. Perhaps the only worthwhile conclusion to be drawn from Risley’s research as well as that of others is that skin color does, in fact, occupy a conspicuous position among Indian Asians—facilitative of victim-group discrimination. Then if it is true that discrimination is a Western norm, Indian Asians, being dark-skinned relative to Euro-Americans, cannot be viewed as potential members of the mainstream society. In America, being dark-skinned may compromise any accomplishment with which one might be associated. But, unlike in America, in India that bias applies class-wide to men as well as women. Bringing their Indian cultural values with them to America, the potency of an immigrant Indian Asian’s disdain for persons having dark skin only increases in their new but also racially stratified environment. Their willingness to discriminate on the basis of skin color may then facilitate an assumed advantage if such persons interact with Westerners who hold similar views. The Indian Asian brand of victim-group discrimination contributes to the development of disdain for dark skin among all people of color, because the disdain is an unheralded expression of Western norms that seemingly compliments the Euro-American power structure. Dark skin color is also regarded as being an obstacle by American institutions, which might otherwise afford an ambitious Asian-American the opportunity to fully assimilate and realize the American Dream. But the reality is that, for Indian Asians who migrate, tensions result when they apply these norms in interacting with persons of color who are dark-skinned, and particularly of a lower socioeconomic class.

In the broader sense, Indian Asians who discriminate on the basis of skin color appear to be less typical than other populations because Indian culture carries color consciousness to the extreme. According to census data, in Western nations such as Canada, Great Britain, and Australia, there are only a limited number of Indian Asian marriages to people of color—arguably due to the issues of darker skin as well as the larger number of Caucasians. In fact, the few exogamous Indian marriages in the United States have been unions with members of the dominant Western mainstream. Furthermore, according to the US Bureau of the Census, in the states with the largest Asian populations, like California, New York, and Washington, exogamous Asian marriage tends to be Asian-American female to Euro-American male [12]. How this phenomenon came about is perhaps too elusive and complex to substantiate scientifically when gender is a factor. Add to that the difficulty of teasing Asians out from other people of color and the task becomes exhaustive. But the tendency of Asian-American females who do marry into other ethnic groups is that they marry almost exclusively Euro-Western males [13].

This tendency is symptomatic of a color-based form of victim-group discrimination. Having internalized dominant Western norms, such persons recognize the social implications if they were to marry a darker-skinned male. Furthermore, for Asians skin color discrimination fits neatly into their culturally ordered system of hierarchy. In particular, for those who have migrated to the United States, it may be their only chance to move up the caste ladder if they are not themselves light-skinned. On the other hand, marriage to Western males is presumed by Asian females to at least lighten their skin (psychologically) in the present via identification with their mates and in the future via mixed white race offspring. Additionally, for some Asian groups, such as the Japanese, the concept of attractiveness had been associated with light skin long before contact with Europeans. Once they began to migrate west, where light skin was a norm of the dominant group, racist perceptions of being marriageable were powerfully reinforced within the immigrating Asian-American population and effectively dramatized in American motion pictures.

Wearing a thin guise of fiction, the 1992 movie *Mississippi Masala* brought an ancient reality to the modern day. In a seeming anomaly of the Hindu caste system, the lowest among Indian Asians may discriminate against dark-skinned minorities of higher status. This would be the grist of black comedy if it were not so tragic. In *Mississippi Masala*—Masala being an East Indian term for a collection of hot and colorful spices—the dark-skinned hero is an intense and physically characteristic Southern, African-American male, played by African-American actor, Denzel Washington. The director of this poignant, funny, and provocative film is Mira Nair, a native of India and a woman with a commanding view of present-day intricacies of caste and color. She brings to life the dynamic ways in which those factors interact, both in Mississippi and in Madras, to shape the lives of East Indians and those with whom they live, love, and work. Many Americans have only a vague conception of that hereditary and restrictive but somewhat adaptive institution that is the Hindu caste, and suppose only that on any given level, color and caste are coordinated with those at the top—privileged and light-skinned—and those at the

bottom—destitute, very dark-skinned, and much discriminated against [10]. The outcome of victim-group discrimination is relevant to the history of other Asian populations.

Asian women in Pakistan are no less given to the Eurocentric standards of feminine beauty than are the Japanese, which increases their potential for victim-group discrimination. One example is a Pakistani woman, a well-educated 23-year-old, named Nasim Jamil [14]. She is young and attractive, but not at all satisfied with the way she looks. “I am not fair enough,” she commented to a local news organization. She further maintains, “White is best. When you ask Pakistani women what their opinion of an ideal woman is, they will tell you that she should have fair skin,” according to Fozia Yasmin, who works for the Pakistani nongovernmental organization who reported to the IRIN news organization. There are at least 50% of women Yasmin has encountered, who have sought her out for concerns about their skin color. Her company employs three practitioners who offer workshops at colleges for building self-esteem in the lives of Asian women who dislike their skin color. “You see advertisements for skin [bleaching] creams everywhere you go in this country,” which is not at all uncommon. As women who reside in an Islamic nation, they are expected to look their best without exception while simultaneously required to be subservient to men [14]. The outcome of this phenomenon relative to victim-group discrimination is manifested as Asian-American Eurogamy.

The concept of Eurogamy among Asian-Americans is a well-known but seldom acknowledged form of victim-group discrimination; Eurogamy is a theoretical construct devised by myself [15], after years of study and clinical observations. Eurogamy can be categorized as selected marital patterns, specific and dictated by group domination under the rubric of exogamy. Eurogamy reflects similar deliberate Asian marital strategies practiced by Asians in India. It is the preferred marital pattern of a less powerful group, Asian-Americans, for moving into a more powerful dominant group of mainstream white Americans. In acquiring Caucasian genes through marriage and offspring, the discriminatory stigma of Asian skin color and features is altered in Asian offspring. Idealized light skin and Western round eyes then qualify Asian-Americans for complete assimilation and the commensurate quality of life it implies. It occurs most frequently among Asian-Americans who settle in large urban centers.

In New York City, Asian-Americans who marry Eurogamously tend to be second generation or later, born in the West, female, older, better educated, of higher occupational status, and have higher incomes [16]. Such urbanized Asian-Americans are associated less with the customarily closed Asian community. Whether or not their marrying Eurogamously adversely affects their children has not been established as a fact of research, but their children do appear to have problems psychologically, according to Betty Lee Sung [16]. However, Eurogamy is not illegal or unethical to any appreciable extent. Its significance for victim-group discrimination is rooted in its relevancy to victimism. Asian-Americans who are culturally dominated in a racist social environment are amenable to victim-group discrimination as a *de facto* requirement of becoming an American. Such discrimination merged with discriminatory cultural traditions is apparent in the selection of marriage partners,

based upon the esteem of their partners' racial group affiliation, which is idealized when Caucasian. The volumes of data pertaining to mail-order brides support such a contention, as seen in the following examples.

In a given year, thousands of Asian women post their photos in mail-order magazines such as *Sunshine Girls* in hopes of marrying Caucasian men via Eurogamy. Such women are not necessarily racist but have a pronounced sense of human hierarchy and seek a better life for themselves with little protection from the many risks involved in using such magazines.

To illustrate the extent of Eurogamy, I requested random samples of *Sunshine Girls* for years 1991–2000 (one issue for each year) [17]. Listed in the magazine were a total of 620 girls, aged 18–30 years, from Asian groups including Filipinas, Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Indonesian, Malaysian, and “other” to accommodate an occasional Russian. For the most part, race was not a significant aspect of the girls' requirement for correspondence. However, of those Asian women who mentioned race, approximately 96% requested Caucasian men, 2% requested Asian men, and 2% requested Hispanic men. The most Caucasians selected were by far by Chinese (30%), Japanese (27%), and Koreans (14%). This would concur with the reputation of groups culturally inclined to human ranking by skin color hierarchy. Indonesian and Malaysian women, a much darker-skinned group, requested Caucasian as well (12%). Of the total Indonesian/Malaysian group, one requested “no blondes please.” As for Filipinas posted in *Sunshine Girls*, 11% requested Caucasian men and 2% requested Hispanic men. As a result of colonization and Western world dominance, it would appear that the appeal of Eurogamy is progressively increasing. The outcome will provide the basis upon which victim-group discrimination can be sustained. More substantial conclusions can be drawn by applying the same phenomenon to empirical research.

Given the impact of Western influence upon their psyche, Asian-Americans have been no less susceptible to that which approximates the denigration of dark skin. Such denigration by default led to an increase in the idealization of light skin. An effort to determine the existence of such idealization among Southeast Asians was done by me, using a sample of college students. In my study, the following null hypothesis was formulated to provide a context for investigating the problem: “There is no relationship between skin color and selected values for skin color ideals.” The sample consisted of 256 participants. Respondents had a reported mean age of 18.5 years. A self-reporting instrument, the Cutaneo-Chroma Correlate (CCC), was utilized for measuring their skin color. This instrument was developed and previously pilot tested by myself to assess the relationship between skin color and various aspects of skin color ideals vis-à-vis sections “A,” “B,” and “C” [18]. Table 5.1, detailing Section “B” (of the CCC), was used to assess the respondent's personal values pertaining to the idealization of light skin. In differentiating responses, a designation of lightest was noted as 5, light as 4, medium as 3, dark as 2, and darkest as 1; Table 5.2 shows the results of the queries.

Section B of the CCC, administered to Asian students, consisted of a total of 15 queries. The total number of responses to such queries was 3734, which included a range total of 53. The sum of responses by *N* totaled 10,454. The mean score of all

Table 5.1 Cutaneo-Chroma Correlate, Section B: Assessing respondent personal values pertaining to the idealization of light skin

	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
Section B:	Very light	Light	Medium	Dark	Very dark
Directions:					
Section B consists of 15 items that will collect information about your personal values. Express your preference about Asians by shading, ON THE ANSWER SHEET, your choice from the above codes.					
15. Pretty skin is					
16. The skin color of pretty women is					
17. The skin color of the man women like is					
18. I wish my skin color was					
19. The skin color of smart Asians is					
20. The skin color of Asians who are snobs is					
21. The skin color of Asians who are kind is					
22. The skin color of my best friend is					
23. I want my child(ren)'s skin color to be					
24. My ideal spouse's skin color is					
25. The skin color of my family should be					
26. The skin color of my race (Asian) should be					
27. The skin color of Asians who are physically strong is					
28. The skin color of Asians who are dumb is					
29. The ideal skin color of my child(ren)'s spouse/s is					

Table 5.2 Results of Cutaneo-Chroma Correlate, Section B: Assessing respondent personal values pertaining to the idealization of light skin

Query	N	Range	Sum	MN	SD
15.	252	4	648	2.57	0.61
16.	254	3	737	2.90	0.63
17.	254	3	621	2.44	0.59
18.	245	4	714	2.91	0.52
19.	244	4	534	2.19	1.25
20.	247	4	753	3.05	0.50
21.	255	4	729	2.86	0.64
22.	253	4	650	2.57	0.54
23.	250.	3	691	2.76	0.59
24.	251	4	694	2.76	0.48
25.	250	3	731	2.92	0.40
26.	244	4	847	3.47	0.77
27.	233	4	717	3.08	1.31
28.	249	3	667	2.68	0.52
29.	253	3	721	2.85	0.46

means (=15) was 2.80. The mean score of all standard deviations (=15) was .654. The maximum skin color measure being 5, very light, light, medium, dark, and very dark were collapsed into light and dark categories. A score of 2.50 was calculated

as the cutoff between dark and light skin color categories (light skin >2.50 , dark skin <2.50). Dark skin was preferred as per item 17 ("The skin color of the man women like is") and 19 ("The skin color of smart Asians is") at a mean of 2.44 and 2.19, respectively. All other item means (15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29) exceeded a 2.50 mean calculated as light skin. The highest mean (3.47) was calculated for item 26 ("The skin color of my race (Asian) should be"). A mean of 3.08 was calculated for item 27 ("The skin color of Asians who are physically strong is") and 3.05 for item 20 ("The skin color of Asians who are snobs is"). Referring to the above data, it would appear with some reservation that light skin is ideally valued among Asian respondents to whom the test was administered.

According to these data, the presumption of a relationship between skin color and selected values for skin color ideals is plausible. The mean total was 2.80 for all 15 items. This score exceeded the light skin cutoff suggesting an idealization of light skin among those respondents who were tested. There are then implications for light skin as an idealized physical trait, which once internalized enables victim-group discrimination. This conclusion would illuminate the perception of light skin in the milieu of the population questioned. Dark skin—in queries 17 and 19—was preferred only in men and smart Asians. These findings would appear to contradict—or at least challenge—the presumption of professed Asian indifference to skin color. It also implies a reflection of continuing and pervasive Western domination that denigrates persons characterized by dark skin in all other item categories. It is a denigration that can be described as a product of Western racism exhibited by the West toward all people of color. Among world powers where "whiteness" is ideal, light skin invariably represents the aesthetic standard. The scores of Asian students on section "B" of the CCC test suggested their tendency to appreciate selected ideals in self and others on the basis of color preferences. Such appreciation could be used to assess human status and social worth, thereby contributing to the prospects of victim-group discrimination, as dramatically displayed in the experiences of an Asian-American, named Ying Ma, with black Americans.

Ying Ma represents a classic example of psychological colonization in the discrimination against oppressed victim-group populations [19]. It is her contention that what is perceived as racism today completely misses the point. She criticizes President Clinton's Race Initiative panel for ignoring the real race problem between minority populations. Of particular concern from her perspective is the hatred directed at Asian-Americans by African-Americans who reside in inner city, low-income neighborhoods. She draws upon her childhood experiences to reach these conclusions.

Ying Ma reportedly migrated from China at age 10. Her family settled in Oakland, California, where crime, poverty, and racial tension were prevalent. She felt out of place by the clothes she wore and her inability to speak English. Her classmates began calling her Ching Chong, China girl, and Chow Mein. They degraded her culture, language, ethnicity, and race. In her typical Asian way, Ying Ma remained silent.

Eventually, Ying Ma improved her command of the English language but did not respond to verbal insults, perhaps due to her cultural norm. Her trips to and from

school were a constant effort to circumvent harassment. She endured many insults on her bus ride home, such as spit balls, profanity, and shouts of “stupid Chinamen.” The label Chinamen was applied to any person who displayed an Asian appearance, such as Vietnamese, and Koreans. Unlike other Asians on the bus who tuned out the insults, Ying Ma took them personally and indicted an entire race on into adulthood by what she experienced as a child. The fact that light-skinned African-Americans, middle-class African-Americans, or other victim-group populations suffered similar insults from the same group did not matter. Ying Ma used this opportunity to reach the first psychological milestone in her being, nonviolently conquered by her internalization of colonial psychic matter in the way she valued dominant-group perspectives and ideals.

Despite the racism and discrimination, which characterize any impoverished inner-city neighborhood, Ying Ma grew increasingly bitter and outraged by African-Americans. She admits with a pride and arrogance that her fluency in English eventually surpassed that of those who had harassed her during childhood. This was the second psychological milestone in that her perception of African-Americans reflects the stereotype of their assumed intellectual inferiority as professed by Herrnstein and Murray in *The Bell Curve* [20]. What is more, she admits to being the object of vulgar sexual remarks, which she contends, embarrassed her. This complaint about sexual vulgarities is another critical aspect of dominant-group stereotypes regarding African-Americans that extend from the antebellum period. In that era, prior to significant Asian migration, Southern slave traders sought to demean African-Americans in their stereotype of the “black beast rapist,” still tacitly used by news media today.

Ying Ma was mindful not only of the insults hurled at her personally by African-American students but also of those hurled at other Asians as well. She recalls a middle-aged Chinese vendor in her high school cafeteria who spoke poor English. On a daily basis, African-American students insulted him with shouts of “dumb Ching!” Ying Ma describes African-Americans who would approach elderly Asians to frighten them, taunting “Yee-ya, Ching-chong, ah-ee, un-yahhh!” She further takes issue with African-Americans who would insist that her people “go back to where you came from!” By the time she graduated high school and left inner-city Oakland, Ying Ma had been effectively given to victim-group discrimination enhanced by the discrimination she may have personally experienced individually from African-Americans.

Ying Ma was pleased to graduate high school because it gave her an opportunity to escape the “black animals” in Oakland. She enrolled at a college made beautiful by its distance from inner-city Oakland. Like those who had colonized her own people, Ying Ma had cooperated in the colonization of inner-city Oakland in that she only took from the community and gave nothing back [19]. Today, she continues to reminisce about what she refers to as “black racism.” She recalls an African-American woman shouting at a Korean man in a command of English obviously now inferior to her own: “You f—ing Chinese person! Didn’t you hear that I asked you to move yo’ ass? You too stupid to understand English or something?” Ying Ma was then emotionally jaded and completely disinterested in the overarching dynamics that might have preceded such a discriminatory confrontation.

In a colonized testimony, Ying Ma refers to Asians all across America, who are experiencing what she went through as a child. She contemplates the stereotype of her own people—another manifestation of psychological colonization—as having language deficiencies, small size, and their enduring silence. Most of them, she assumes, will never escape the “black ghetto” for a beautiful “white” neighborhood far away. This makes them hate African-Americans, whom she contends much of America refuses to acknowledge as capable of racism and otherwise victim-group discrimination.

Commensurate with victim-group discrimination, Ying Ma directs her criticisms at “prominent black leaders” who refuse to acknowledge the existence of “black racism.” She refers to activists, such as Al Sharpton and Jesse Jackson, as if she had been tutored by their political adversaries. Even the world-renowned John Hope Franklin, African-American history scholar and chair of President Clinton’s race panel, cannot escape her criticism. She insists that African-Americans such as Franklin complain continuously about racism inflicted by whites while completely ignoring discrimination by African-Americans against innocent Asian-Americans.

Ying Ma does not limit her victim-group discrimination to African-Americans. In the spirit of subjugation, she criticizes the leadership of the Asian community as well: a no less insidious form of victim-group discrimination. According to her, they have failed to act upon “black racism” because they fear African-Americans. Describing a rally she attended in New York City’s Chinatown, Ying Ma had gone to learn about Indonesia’s history of discrimination against ethnic Chinese. That discrimination had recently resulted in a wave of bloody anti-Chinese riots. Without prompting, Ying Ma heard a woman, Mee Ying Lin, at the rally begin to scream hysterically about her frustrations with African-American racism. Mee Ying Lin had felt similarly about African-Americans, as did Ying Ma—she hated them. By then, Ying Ma was certain that others had felt just as she that African-Americans aside from being the victims of racial discrimination were perpetrators of racial discrimination as well.

Ying Ma contends that the reason black racism is ignored is that the Asian leadership is out of touch with the common Asian community. That disconnect is even more pronounced at the national level. A disproportionate representation of the Asian leadership consists of assimilated Asian-Americans whose families may have migrated to America several generations ago or sooner. They have a different perspective and different concerns compared to their more recent migrant counterparts. Furthermore, there may be class, language, and cultural differences that alienate Asian leadership from its assimilated ethnic counterparts. Thus, they cannot know or understand the critical issues faced by the poor because they live comfortable middle-class lives. This disconnect encourages many Asian-Americans to then remain silent about black racism.

Despite the harsh realities of victim-group discrimination, Ying Ma acknowledges that there is some Asian prejudice and discrimination against African-Americans. The lowest class and least educated among black Americans understand this, which is perhaps an underlying factor in their victim-group discrimination against Asian-Americans. However, Ying Ma’s response is to trivialize it and all but dismiss it as being relevant to black racism. After all, Asian prejudices,

she muses, can't possibly be that significant because many Asians who migrate to America had never even seen a "black" person before coming to America. Somehow, intellectually, Ying Ma dismisses the popular sale of "darkie" toothpaste in Korea [21], the international criticism of Japan for their official denigration of "black" people, and the comments by Japan's Prime Minister Nakasone that African-Americans are a social problem [22]. More importantly, Ying Ma dismisses historical Chinese culture, which demeaned everything Western and taught the young that all non-Chinese—particularly dark-skinned Africans—were barbarians. Subsequently, Asian migrants, who had never seen a black person prior to coming to America, considered them inferior, which destined them to an Asian version of victim-group discrimination.

References

1. Kitano, H. (1985). *Race relations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
2. Garrett, K. (1999). Are Asians racist? ABC Radio online. <http://www.abc.net.au/rn/talks/bbing/stories/s36894.htm>. Accessed 19 April 2009.
3. Kolenda, P. (1978). *Caste in contemporary India*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
4. Parrillo, V. (1990). *Strangers to these shores*. New York: Macmillan.
5. Wagatsuma, H. (1967). The social perception of skin color in Japan. *Daedalus*, 96, 407–443.
6. Chang, I. (1997). *The rape of Nanking*. New York: Penguin Books.
7. Chang, I. (1997). *The rape of Nanking*. New York: Penguin Books.
8. Washington, R. (1990). Brown racism and the formation of a world system of racial stratification. *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, 4(2), 209–227.
9. Mazumdar, S. (1989). Racist response to racism: the Aryan myth and south Asians in the U.S. *South Asian Bulletin*, 9(1), 47–55.
10. Hall, R. E. (1994). The bleaching syndrome: light skin, psychic conflict and the domination model of western assimilation. *Indian Journal of Social Work*, 55(3), 405–418.
11. Davis, K. (1941). Intermarriage in caste society. *American Anthropologist*, 43, 386–387.
12. Risely, H. (1908). *The people of India*. Calcutta: Thacker, Spink and Company.
13. Sung, B. (Fall, 1990). Chinese American intermarriage. *Journal of Comparative America Studies*, 21(3), 337–352.
14. [IRIN] (2004). Pakistan focus on skin bleaching. Irinnews online, UN Office of Humanitarian Affairs. <http://www.irinnews.org/report.aspx?reportid=18174>. Accessed 9 April 2009.
15. Hall, R. E. (1997). Eurogamy among Asian-Americans: a note on western assimilation, *Social Science Journal*, 34(3), 403–408.
16. Sung, B. (Fall, 1990). Chinese American intermarriage. *Journal of Comparative American Studies*, 21(3), 337–352.
17. Hall, Ronald E. (2006). *Bleaching beauty: light skin as a Filipina ideal*. Quezon City: Giraffe Books.
18. Hall, R. E. (1990). The projected manifestations of aspiration, personal values, and environmental assessment cognates of cutaneo-chroma (skin color) for a selected population of African Americans (Doctoral dissertation, Atlanta University, 1989). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 50, 3363A.
19. Ying Ma, (1998). Black racism: the hate that dare not speak its name. *American Enterprise*, 9, Nov. 01.
20. Herrnstein, R., & Murray, C. (1994). *The bell curve*. New York: Free Press.
21. [Darkie Toothpaste] <http://www.sinosplice.com/life/archives/2004/11/26/darkie-toothpaste>. Accessed 26 April 2009.
22. [Nakasone] <http://alum.mit.edu/news/WhatMatters/Archive/200612/>. Accessed 26 April 2009.

Chapter 6

Latino-Americans: Skin Color and Mixed-Race People

Discrimination in some form is as old as Western civilization itself [1]. However, in a historical context, discrimination by victim-group populations on the basis of skin color is a relatively recent phenomenon. Among Latino-Americans, similar to other victim-group populations, such discrimination is the direct result of Euro-American domination, including the traditions of immigration and the assimilation experience. Following their various forms of domination, Western colonials who associated more often with Spanish and Catholic, as opposed to British and Protestant, evolved a no less potent skin color hierarchy, as dramatically displayed today in the behavioral interactions between and among Latino-Americans and victim populations. The uppermost in status are those whose skin color most approximates that of their lighter-skinned colonizers and the least being an opposite skin color extreme [1]. Historically colonized and in a modern effort to realize mainstream assimilation, Latino-Americans have been imposed upon by a dominant more often homogeneous Spanish racial system that is in many ways not only alien to their indigenous cultural norms but brutal to them psychologically. In consideration of a group more diverse and heterogeneous than any among people of color, the effort of Latino-Americans to assimilate into the mainstream American population has had an adverse affect on their ability to value themselves as people of color. If they are unable to confront the implications of skin color via victim-group discrimination, they will contribute personally to the eventuality of their own demise.

Due to the archaic notion of maintaining racial purity, European populations have historically insisted upon strict codes of assimilation, resulting in relatively segregated, identifiable living arrangements [2]. However, among Latino-Americans that is less evident relative to skin color. The colonial effort to segregate for the purpose of sustaining racial purity was then diminished, as reflected in interracial marital and housing patterns throughout Latin America and the Hispanic Caribbean. As a result, in the Americas, where white populations dominate, race is germane to society. Despite this, among Latino populations race is all but irrelevant by comparison. According to Clara Rodriguez and Hectore Cordero-Guzman [3], racial identity is historically and contextually rooted in traditions alien to Latinos. Conversely, the Western, Eurocentric, biological view of identity is static and hegemonic. The fact that Latinos have been less amenable to the doctrine of racial

purity is not evidence of their being free of acting out racial and other forms of discrimination themselves. Furthermore, despite colonial doctrines of racial purity, interracial couplings have increased the number of multiracial and multicolored persons among Latino-Americans and their counterparts in Latin America as well. In both instances, slavery—while more likely given to Spanish versus British control—was not irrelevant to the social implications of skin color imposed by the colonial and slave-owning classes.

Europeans continued to migrate to America, and the second wave of immigrants is characterized by being those from Third World and/or Latin-American countries. Included among their numbers are immigrants from Asia, Africa, Mexico, and the Caribbean. With some exception, most are nonwhite and dark-skinned by racial identity. They arrive having been subjected in their birth countries to the historical influences of Western colonization. For example, the white influences upon Third World and Latin-American immigrants are apparent in the British colonization of Asians from India and Africans from Ghana or the Spanish colonization of South American nations, in addition to Puerto Rico and its Latino Cuban neighbor. Identifiable as people of color, this second wave of immigrants is considered to be of a minority group who, by Western colonization, are then predisposed to imperial Europe's colonial skin color hierarchy. Nevertheless, as people of color having been dominated by colonial Europeans, they are also members of a victim-group population. Their designation as nonwhite Americans necessitates that, as immigrants, they are the victims of race/skin color discrimination; in the aftermath of colonial domination, simultaneously perpetrators in the discrimination, they act out against other victim-group populations. That discrimination is widely directed at dark-skinned Americans, that is, African-Americans. Despite this historical social phenomenon, there remain scholars in academia who are dominated by white interests and who are trained with hardly any reference at all to the discriminatory implications of skin color in the perpetration of Latino victim-group discrimination. Furthermore, those who teach at some of our most prestigious universities, which serve a substantial Latino population, haven't the faintest idea of how the implications of skin color that are extended from European colonization facilitate victim-group discrimination. Among the second wave of immigrant victim-group populations from Latin America are Nicaraguans, whose colonial experience is typical and dramatically illustrated in its history.

Among Nicaraguans, victim-group discrimination has been all but ignored in the scholarly literature. In fact, among Nicaraguans discrimination is manifested on the basis of skin color, whereby those who are light-skinned presume the social and psychological demeanor of their colonizers. This enables a hierarchy that results in a form of discrimination directed particularly at persons of visible African descent. For newly arrived immigrants of color, the outcome is critical to their ability to thrive within their own communities. Thus, to characterize discrimination via a narrow white supremacy model does a disservice to its pervasiveness. It results in the absurd rhetoric of discrimination limited to white Americans and, in fact, provides a conduit for the continued social, economic, and political oppression of victim-group

populations whereby those characterized by dark skin are the focus of blatant covert and overt oppression.

Many victim-group immigrants who have been socialized under the historical rubric of colonization do in fact discriminate against darker-skinned people of their own ethnic group. Their discrimination is a consequence of having emotionally and psychologically inculcated white and/or European norms. For South Americans, the social and economic impact of skin color is then increasingly potent [1]. The history of Afro-Nicaraguans of Coastal Nicaragua is a microcosm of that part of the continent. There bias is suggested in the very fact that the original colonial African community largely saw itself as the descendant of British civilization. They spoke English and idealized Anglo-Saxon—European—values and cultural practices. They perceived themselves as they were defined—as British subjects. In this context, they began to refer to themselves as Creoles—black persons of European descent—to connote their proximity to the assumed white British master race. They believed themselves to be superior to the indigenous dark-skinned locals, as a consequence of being closer to the British skin color norm. The Creole community in Nicaragua prospered and rose to a position of economic and political eminence during the mid-nineteenth century. By the end of that century, they had been subjugated economically by North Americans and politically by the indigenous population.

At the onset of the twentieth century, Nicaragua's coastal economy had boomed. Peasants migrated there to work as laborers on the rubber and banana plantations. A second wave of African immigrants was brought from Jamaica, the Caymans, San Andres, and the southern United States [4]. They were mostly unskilled or semi-skilled, dark-skinned workers of almost pure African descent. The Creoles, already established on the Atlantic Coast, were landowners, professional people, artisans, and fishermen, as well as functionaries in the new North American enterprises. In short, they were of a higher socioeconomic class than the immigrant Africans. They were also lighter skinned. On the basis of these and other differences, the two groups, both of African descent, were considered distinct, relating to their ability or inability to identify with Great Britain.

The historic social-cultural-racial distinction between these groups has been maintained until very recently. As late as the 1930s, victim-group discrimination was noted by outside observers who visited Nicaragua [4]. With time, however, after a process of miscegenation, the two groups were eventually transformed into one—the people who are known as Creoles today.

In their 300-plus years on the Atlantic Coast, Afro-Nicaraguans have experienced a unique ethnic odyssey. They started out as slaves, dark-skinned, and in the lowest of possible positions in the racist colonial hierarchy. They responded by transforming their culture and language to the point where they were able to deny their African origins and to become the elite of society. With the arrival of “lighter and brighter” cultural groups, they dropped from their lofty position to a middle social level, where they have languished for 75 years. Their odyssey is the key to understanding the contemporary Creole identity and the implications for its future evolution in victim-group discrimination.

Light skin is an important indicator of Creole status. People of African descent in Nicaragua are usually Creole. However, there are many Miskitos, mestizos, and Garifunas who share this same trait, as well as a substantial number of Creoles who do not [4]. In general, light skin is recognized by Creoles as a characteristic of their group. Accordingly, many Creoles do not accept their mutual historical African origins. This is particularly true of the older generation and stems from the historic identification with European and North American colonizers. This distinction limits Creole identification with other people of color, particularly if they are of darker skin. A contradiction exists, however, between the perceptions held by most Creoles of class and their actual situation: By major industrial standards, they are poor. A psychological identification with their colonizers and their position of relative affluence in comparison with the poverty of the rest of the Coastal population is readily apparent, but the Creole's illusions cannot sustain them presently. They are derived from a romanticized collective memory of the long gone colonial past.

Many studies have suggested that what existed in Nicaragua historically is typical for victim-group populations in South America and elsewhere. All are quite sensitive to issues involving skin color. Aware of racism once they reach the US mainland, light-skinned Puerto Ricans may adamantly reject identification with darker-skinned people of color. Data collected from Mexicans, Mexican Americans, Spanish-speaking Americans, and Euro-American immigrants in recent decades have verified high rejection rates of these groups toward all African-Americans. That rejection is especially prominent among Mexican American immigrants from rural areas. The situation is exacerbated by the modern numbers of victim-group immigrants who seek citizenship in white countries, in contrast with white immigrants and in the countries in which they seek residence.

The implications of slavery for victim-group discrimination in South America are less dramatized by US literature, perhaps given to the atrocities of the antebellum era. But slavery is relevant to the early experience of Latinos in both the North and South Americas. The contrast of their dark skin with that of Spanish Europeans was a daily reminder to the colonial power structure of the need for their domination, in order to reaffirm the presumption of white supremacy relevant to modern Latino-American discrimination. Thus, a brand of discrimination was to follow that compromised Latino-American efforts to be assimilated into the mainstream of North American society. This meant that Latinos, whose ancestors had roamed free and uninhibited across wide open American spaces and erected civilizations superior to many in Europe, now found it extremely difficult to feed themselves or raise a family. Thus, given their circumstances, the quality of life suffered for Latino-American males in particular, like black males and their families. The results lessened their ability to thrive as viable citizens of the "new world."

Analogous to that of African-American and other victim-group populations, the skin color of Latinos contrasted with that of the Euro-American colonists. However, the contrast was even more obvious owing to the extremely high concentration of melanin in the skin of Afro-Latinos—those who had mingled blood with black Africans. Dark skin evoked a sexual dilemma in the psyche of colonists. It was perhaps most intensified by the sight of slave women. At night in the cabins of

such women, colonial males lived out their sexual fantasies; by day, they extolled the virtues of fidelity in an attempt to absolve themselves of any impending guilt and to control the urges that Euro-American women might have for slave men [5]. Ordinarily, the contradiction in such behavior would have evoked guilt. But this is perhaps a marvel of the slave master mentality, in that for all his sexual exploitation of slave women, guilt never became an issue, despite moral objections [5]. While sexual contact between colonial males and their slave captives encouraged racial miscegenation, the attitude that allowed the behavior to flourish eventually led to civil war in the United States. And while colonial males violated their own color-coded ethics without legal or social consequences, any male of color, who was found to be sexually involved with a “white” female of the master class, was assumed to be guilty of rape. The urges of colonial males were invested in a slave they could dominate. By the time slavery, as an institution, had been dismantled in North and South America, the West had become fertile ground for denigrating Latino people in whatever forms necessary. This denigration was the genesis of their victim-group discrimination, to which Latino-Americans would be subjected. The denigration and impending fear by stereotype aroused fantasies of hot-blooded *putas* (prostitutes) and knife-wielding bandits. As a result, the Latino males in particular, in the minds of typical Americans, were frequently thought of in the role of beast, seeking vengeance for his woman having been violated [6]. It is this fantasy of fear that incited much of the historical stereotyping aimed at Latino males and continues as justification for discrimination through negative American media images today.

Because skin color was the most obvious difference between colonists who denigrated Latinos, including on the basis of their sexual mores, dark skin evolved as the sublimated symbol of forbidden sexuality [6]. That is, at the same time colonists sought to control the urges that dark skin awakened, they were seduced by its cultural significance. In an attempt to control these urges, taboo by Eurocentric moral standards, the same colonists adopted laws that strictly forbade miscegenation, creating a color-coded concept of “legitimate” and “illegitimate” birth. Children born of colonial males and Latina females were less valued while those born of dual white parentage were accorded legitimacy and all the associated societal privileges. This notion of legitimizing human life was foreign to the local indigenous Latino population and helped initiate the stereotype of the sex-crazed *puta* that became prevalent in American films. No amount of restriction, however, could significantly reduce the dilemma between urge and control of colonial sexual transgressions. Although miscegenation was illegal, an entire mixed-race population of multiracial, multicolored people stood as testimony to the moral failures of Western civilization. By stigmatizing darker skin as a sign of inferiority, the inhumane treatment of Latinos became irrelevant, accommodating a mainstream societal view of them as inferior and criminal by nature. This not only served stereotypes and the civilized society’s myths but, in the effort to cleanse its psyche of the injustices directed at Latino people historically, it enabled their discrimination as an American cultural norm.

As with Western culture, in North America the dark skin of Latinos carries with it a traditional social stigma. Their most salient feature in contrast to Euro-Americans is cutaneo-chroma (skin color). Skin color may have an effect upon every phase of

Latino-American life and psychological well-being because the circumstances of their existence have not accommodated their mental health. Latino's willingness to assimilate regardless reflects an effort not to become Euro-American (or white as some might suggest), like other similarly oppressed people of color, but to improve their quality of life and live the American Dream. In so doing, Latino-Americans may also develop a disdain for dark skin because the disdain is a cultural expectation of Western assimilation. It is regarded by the various societal institutions in the United States as an obstacle, which might otherwise afford opportunities necessary to succeed and live a better quality of life to Latino-Americans.

The stereotypes of Latino-Americans are many in number. Like most, they are associated with just enough truth to make them believable. In order to make a distinction, one needs to know what is based in fact and what is fictional. According to Edward Casavantes, it is safe to say that Latino-Americans have brought many customs from their country of origin: They speak Spanish to some degree, and many have a noticeable accent; they are mostly Catholic, and they are frequently distinguishable from the mainstream American population due to their darker skin and varied hair texture [7]. Furthermore, Casavantes reports a large number of Latino-Americans reside in the Southwestern United States [7]. Their average years of education are fewer than eight and a significant number live below the poverty line. As is frequently the case, Casavantes suggests that many of the stereotypes attributed to Latino-Americans have to do with their impoverished circumstances. For example, fatalism, machismo, and reliance on the group stem from poverty and not necessarily overt Latino culturisms [7].

According to the literature, life among poor Latinos in general has been badly misunderstood. To Euro-Americans, the large families of Latino-Americans are often regarded as stifling and that the women in relationship to men are oppressed. Relative to survival, such dynamics take on a different and more sustaining meaning. As with most sociological groupings, perceptions of Latino-Americans then vary extensively from the facts. It is in this manner that stereotypes have evolved, and in addition to ethnicity, occupational roles and social status have strong effects. As such, the societal images of Latino-Americans available in mass media can be the most potent for enabling discrimination, both against and by them. A Latino's use of accented speech facilitates a number of negative stereotypes. Such stereotypes are reflected in studies that have assessed Euro-American perceptions, which contribute significantly to the problem.

The available research conducted by Frederick Williams, among others, notes the comments made about people who have accented speech [8]. A number of conclusions were drawn: (a) Teacher attitudes toward taped samples of children's speech are most often judged using two dimensions, "confidence-eagerness" and "ethnicity-nonstandardness"; (b) children who use nonstandard English are perceived to have important academic limitations; and (c) there is a good deal of heterogeneity of language attitudes among teachers, which is not entirely a function of the ethnicity of the teacher. With respect to the last conclusion, it was identified via factor analysis of five teacher types based on their evaluations of Euro-American, African-American, and Latino-American students. One of the types tended to rate

Latino-American children as particularly “nonstandard,” while another type did not consistently distinguish between Euro-American and Latino-American children. Both types included the same distributions of teachers by ethnic group.

Other research has concluded negative stereotypes of Latino-Americans brought by accented speech. Richard Rodriguez finds that fluent users of English are also stereotyped if they speak with an accent [8]. Albert Ramirez further investigated the effect of communicator ethnicity and its social influence. Using 116 Latino adults in an apartment setting, he found that subjects reacted equally positively toward Euro-American and Latino-American communicators, but they were more likely to comply with requests for behavior made by the Euro-American communicator. Similar findings, reported by Albert Ramirez and Thomas M. Lasater [9], add that minority communicator evaluation depends upon the evaluator’s self-esteem. Those evaluators with high self-esteem responded more positively to the Latino-American communicator than those with low self-esteem.

The stereotype of Latino people is not without consequence. Both males and females suffer from the portrayal of two distinct media types that have changed very little over the years. Their emphasis has arguably accommodated Euro-American views that they are resistant to assimilation. For this reason, perhaps, the healthy well-rounded masculine Latino image has not been very popular among Euro-American audiences. It conflicts with their preferred version of reality.

The long and active history of stereotypes among all forms of US media inhibits the perception of what is real. The outcome has influenced the treatment of Latino-Americans by other societal institutions tremendously. In particular is the inability of the Latino male to receive fair and just treatment from the criminal justice system, which is perhaps a critical example of discrimination. For the most part, this has attracted little attention in academe. It has no immediate implications for exact science or technology. But if the stereotypes are not considered in the American struggle for justice and equality, the future of the Latino community as a whole will very likely be put at risk by those very institutions such as law enforcement designed to help sustain it.

As an institution, perhaps police see the ugliest side of humanity on a daily basis. Psychologically, it is virtually impossible for them not to be adversely affected by the stereotypical implications of dark skin that permeate Western society. What is more, police generally are underpaid and overworked. The most negative of police scholars must admit this much. However, the masculinity concept of the typical police officer is virtually ignored. It may be a factor in the ability of the individual officer to use force with or without brutality. This is important given literally hundreds of law enforcement agents who are licensed to carry a weapon, ranking in order from federal officers such as the FBI and the CIA, who are the elite, down to the city cop and the county sheriff. The strictest degree of qualification and scrutinizing for prospective employees is required at the federal level, where pay is highest. Extensive background checks, psychological testing, and, in some cases, masters degrees are necessary to meet requirements.

For local police personnel, standards are not quite as stringent. For job candidates, educational requirements range from having some college to no college.

Furthermore, there are cases where local policemen on the job do not have a high school diploma—a very basic requirement, which says he or she can read and write reasonably well [10]. Police psychological testing and background checks range from the strictest to the loosest of policies. As far as the ability of local police to use force without brutality, this represents the crux of the problem. That is not to say that federal police agencies are not guilty of brutality, but their masculinity is less threatened because they represent a higher socioeconomic class. They are much more secure as males, having managed to earn some success and esteem within the system.

The lower socioeconomic status of local police, on the other hand, means they are less secure about their role as men, given the implications of wealth for masculinity in societal terms. The largest in number, they are the least educated, least skilled, and lowest paid. They are, in many cases, similar to the Latino males as a class, against whom they may be called upon to exercise force. Their masculinity is particularly threatened because they do not have the class buffer to protect their self-esteem. They tend to be more primal in their regard for Latino males and are obsessed with behaviors they perceive in a sexual context. This results in an excessive urge to confront Latino males with violent force when it is not necessary, convincing themselves that it is to uphold the law. The motivating factors are to resist their assimilation and to enable a concept of masculinity that is defined and threatened on the basis of dark skin, and which is relevant to law enforcement activities.

The position of the police is that race is irrelevant to being accosted, but, in fact, skin color is the basis for being stopped according to three victim-group males (including one Latino-American) who were shot by state troopers. As the four males drove along the New Jersey turnpike in a rented van, police pulled them over and opened fire, striking three of the males, critically wounding two of them. At police headquarters, officers contend the suspects were stopped because radar showed the van to be traveling at an excessive rate of speed. Later, that police department was forced to admit that they had no radar equipment. The shooting circumstances were then relegated as being otherwise unnecessary to formal investigation.

The most troubling aspect of this New Jersey incident, aside from the shootings, is the fact that no less than 3 years earlier a New Jersey judge concluded that state troopers were practicing racial profiling. Instead of doing what was necessary to eradicate such blatant forms of discrimination from the ranks of law enforcement, the Attorney General sided with the troopers to appeal the case. After the case became public, the Attorney General declined to pursue the case because of his concern for winning a political office.

It would appear, by the New Jersey case, that discrimination by skin color reaches every level of the American judicial system, extending to citizens regardless of race a constant source of stress otherwise irrelevant to lighter-skinned law-abiding citizens. That the problem in New Jersey is so pervasive is exemplified by a decision of the United States Justice Department to intervene should the New Jersey governor decide to ignore it.

The constant stresses experienced by Latino-American and other victim-group males should come as no surprise because it permeates law enforcement policies. For example, the state of New Jersey eventually admitted that State Police targeted certain motorists for drug searches along the New Jersey Turnpike [11]. These tactics, while racist and unethical, are not irrelevant in Russia, where the KGB recruits members of the community to spy on its citizenry. In New Jersey, law enforcement has recruited motel workers to spy on patrons who speak Spanish—a language associated with crime. In New York, law enforcement denies the use of racial profiling, but a recent story in *Crain's New York Business* raises serious questions [11]. The newspaper interviewed 20 professionals who all gave detailed accounts of their experiences with racial profiling, having been singled out and humiliated by police, usually for being darker-skinned and driving expensive cars.

This kind of continuous discrimination has deepened feelings of alienation among affluent, dark-skinned, professional males who had hoped that success would allow them to become bona fide Americans. But instead of fading into the American patchwork, they have become an ever more popular target for law enforcement agencies. Victimized families bear a heavy stress burden that keeps their blood pressure abnormally high due to their males being targeted [12]; many are worried that fathers, sons, brothers, and husbands may one day be murdered by police officers convinced of racist criminal stereotypes.

If police perception is an accurate account of how Latino males are perceived, then their treatment once they are processed into the judicial system will be impacted. Ideally, the judicial system of any nation operates on the basis of what is just and moral. The treatment of Latino-American males by the American system forces one to accept that they are either innately criminal or unfairly processed. That processing does not begin and end with the court. It includes all components, from the arresting officer who makes a decision about what has taken place to the parole board, which has to make a determination regarding his release. For the most part, these components are controlled at every phase, by workers who may have embraced a stereotype. It is reflected in the excessive number of Latino males who are incarcerated in American prisons. In many instances, the crimes that led to their incarceration are a simple matter of poverty or lack of employment. Furthermore, it is ironic that in a time of grave fiscal crisis there remains a national sentiment to incarcerate at greater expense than would be incurred to provide offenders with an Ivy League level of education. As more Latino males succumb to this fate, the crime rate does not seem to be declining. Perhaps the root cause is more a matter of them being victims of discrimination rather than criminals. The experience of Latino-Americans, as victims of discrimination, is relevant to victimism—as a matter of acting out discrimination themselves. Pertaining to victimism, members of a dark-skinned, victim-group population such as Latino-Americans have not been immune to the pressures of dominant-group assimilation and their various experiences with stereotype discrimination. In a culture where racism remains the unspoken social pathology, Latinos have resorted to acting out discrimination against other victim-group populations based on skin color, spurred by dominant-group stereotypes [13].

According to Florestan Fernandes [14], various forms of discrimination have existed among Latinos because of the influences of European cultural norm. In some Latin-American countries, such as Brazil, it is more the fact of a class system that is readily apparent to visitors. But when applied to dark- and light-skinned Brazilians, that is, blacks and mulattos, both a caste and a class system combine to make for a formidable social obstacle. Traditional influences helped sustain and cause various forms of discrimination to be recapitulated in a racial hierarchy that reportedly no longer exists. This otherwise archaic manifestation of human interaction favors the tenacity and invigoration of the colonial model of human interaction. Such a model prevailed almost completely intact until the 1930s. Referencing the abolition of slavery, that would be the better part of a century. Thus, today it is impossible to state without reservation that the abolition of slavery is irreversible or that the colonial model is irrelevant. Brazilian society remains wedded to the past and is constantly charged with sustaining obvious discrimination, including the economic and social distance between light- and dark-skinned Latino-Americans.

According to Fernandes [14], the eventual disappearance of the colonial model of human interaction will not become extinct until such time as the entire dark-skinned population reaches a class existence similar to that of the white and/or light-skinned population. That will require that the colonial social order be diminished. Whites must necessarily relinquish control of the economic, social, and cultural fields of the country, which give them an unfair advantage. For the most part, racial discrimination in Brazil is more a product of inequality between groups and the tenacious social order than in pointed racist arrangements, but is no less discrimination in the outcomes.

Skin color bias and other forms of victim-group discrimination occurred in Brazil as a result of the enslavement of Africans. Unlike in the Protestant United States, the Catholic Church discouraged the enslavement of black people. It influenced the slave master to provide slaves with access to religious instruction in the hopes of converting them. Ultimately, this implied that before God both slave and master were equal. In an effort to rescue the slave master's psyche, a custom was developed that regarded the act of enslavement as beneficial to the bonded. Therefore, the slave-slave master relationship would be free of condemnation before the Church. Black slaves as a group were thus considered dependent for their existence and survival upon the responsibility so generously assumed by their master. The ultimate regard for slaves then became synonymous with the most extreme denigration biologically and psychologically possible.

The force of Brazil's colonialist traditions was enabled by institutional and customary norms. Many of the rationales for slavery were in fact borrowed from Western Roman law. Contrary to the Catholic Church, Roman law did not regard black slaves as having status equal to that of a master. In the aftermath, the slave master was allowed nearly unlimited authority over their human chattel. Influenced by the Church and Roman law, the bias against not only blacks but other dark-skinned citizens—including mulattoes and the descendants of both—became a moral sanction in the context of society.

Unlike in the United States, a slave's social standing was assumed to be contingent upon that of the mother. Ironically, skin color and other racial criteria were secondary influences. Perhaps dark skin was a sign of slave status, whether free or not it was an implication and thus a vehicle for discrimination. On the other hand, discrimination became a reality due to the association of a person's biological heritage. Discrimination on the basis of skin color was assumed to be an institutionalized phenomenon given to the slave trade. If slavery was to succeed, it was necessary that relations between master and slave exist for the interest and domination of one by the other. The social order would have to be commensurate. Since the basis of distinction between master and slave was most obvious by skin color, skin color was a most effective means of sustaining the institution. The practice of discrimination by skin color was also a way to sustain separation of the races and serve the continuation of the slave trade.

By all accounts, Brazil's version of discrimination by skin color was unique in two respects. The first pertains to a structural and dynamically social relationships, the other pertains to racial dynamics. While the master and slave might act out a warm and friendly relationship, in other situations they were in direct opposition as members of contrasting social categories. Such a relationship served the colonial social structure and maintenance of a strict social order. It corresponded to the colonial principles of economic and social organization. Subsequently, the white master race could prevail upon the nation at large for its welfare despite criminal intent. They exported their values, norms, and cultural mores, which all embraced—including blacks and mulattoes, who no doubt were also victims.

For Latino-Americans and other people of color, the association of skin color with physical beauty, an issue frequently unknown to whites, may cause stress and psychological problems [15]. This may also be an unresolved obstacle to mental health. Several contemporary examples of the phenomenon exist, including the juxtaposition of light skin with physical beauty—particularly among victim-group women [16]. For example, among Latinos, those characterized by light skin and Caucasian features continue to be more sought for marriage by high socioeconomic status (SES) males [17].

The implications of skin color variations among Latino-Americans have had a devastating social impact upon them. Overtly motivated by white supremacy and covertly condoned by the dominant population, skin color is the unspoken factor in the various confrontations had by Latino-Americans with societal institutions [1]. Dark skin, in North and South America and abroad, also correlates with a lack of economic and political power, apparent in nations where the West has had a considerable influence. In Puerto Rico, for example, skin colors vary from the darkest African type to the lightest European type. It is no secret that the power structure in that nation happens to be light-skinned. In Cuba, which arguably has limited Western influence, there is a similar reality. The light skin of Fidel Castro looks more in appearance like the Western version of a power structure with which he has been at odds for decades [1]. Just how the situation in each nation came about is a matter for debate. The fact that it exists is obvious to anyone who has observed Latin America and elsewhere. Thus, while Puerto Rico, Cuba, Brazil, and other

Latin countries comprising South America are all very different culturally, they have this one fact in common: At some point in their history, they were all colonized and/or dominated by a European power structure. Because colonization/domination is an unequal exchange, the choice of influence obviously traveled in one direction. Hence, in each of these nations, individuals in positions of affluence and power are also disproportionately light-skinned. The preconceived notions had by light-skinned people about dark-skinned people made their discrimination against the dark skin more acceptable to everyone, including many of its victims.

As the valued status of light-skinned Latinos suggests, resentment based upon skin color still exists among them. Persons of various hues may guard feelings toward one another during social activities. Those in the community who happen to be of medium skin color play a role in the dynamics, but they are stigmatized less because of being endowed with attributes that gain acceptance by both light- and dark-skinned group members. As a result, medium-skinned Latinos may make their way into the social circles of both light- and dark-skinned persons, while the same ability for light- and dark-skinned Latinos is lessened. Although their skin color per se is relative, consider the ratio between dark-skinned and light-skinned Latinos with naturally straight hair, who live in poverty (male or female) and who marry up socioeconomically. Yet there are those in the community who will adamantly deny any notion that skin color makes a difference. Whether that is fact is less relevant, for that assumption may indeed be value laden and dependent upon one's social and economic milieu. My intent here is merely to chronicle the different manifestations of color consciousness in an environment where dark skin has become a vehicle of victim-group discrimination. However, being a light-skinned Latino-American in and of itself is not necessarily a problem, but the racist codes of behavior and a history associated with it create an issue [18]. Thus, having light skin does not necessarily mean that one has a problem with one's Latino identity. On the other hand, to have dark skin should not necessarily imply that one has a healthy regard for one's heritage. And when the various skin color factions encounter one another, assumptions about identity are made based solely upon the darkness or lightness of one's skin. For those who have a strong identity behold to their culture and who just happen to be light-skinned may mean a constant effort to be accepted by darker-skinned Latinos who do not know them. On the other hand, Latinos who detest Latino culture and just happen to be dark, like blacks, are given the benefit of the doubt with regard to their ethnic loyalty. Furthermore, some light-skinned Latinos may see such discrimination and make the choice to distance themselves from the masses to avoid the pain of ridicule and rejection. The problem in this scenario is that it promotes disunity. It impairs the ability of light-skinned individuals to engage a sense of belonging within the group. So acute are these phenomena that they may exist as discrimination even among blood-related family members [19].

Latino-American skin color experience is a manifestation of racism that has been all but excluded from the scholarly literature. This omission is apparent to anyone who has reviewed such literature. In books about American territories, there is little mention, if any, of behavioral manifestations of discrimination in the Latino community. Where racism is mentioned, it is limited to the powers of France, Spain, and

England in their crimes against people of color. As a result, there is a deep void of information regarding skin color as a historical basis of discrimination in general, and the present day in particular. Its importance would further illustrate the extent of European domination of the Latino-American psyche.

Joe E. and Clairece Feagin refer to type A and type B racism/discrimination existing in America. In type A, individual members of the dominant race group intentionally take part in harmful actions directed at members of minority race groups, that is, Latino and other people of color [20]. Type B discrimination refers to harmful actions on the part of dominant-group members in concert with one another for the purposes of racial discrimination. In both instances, race is a key element to the act of discrimination and has evolved to dictate perceptions of the concept. As a result, the courts and the society at large have become all but completely intolerant of racial discrimination *du jour* and its associated behaviors. However, the lines of racial demarcation are now less distinctive in the aftermath of an increase in interracial marriages, particularly among Latino-Americans, that will necessarily continue in the future. Unfortunately, the act of discrimination has not dissipated, but has continued to manifest and is apparent in the context of skin color discrimination among the various victim-group populations.

Pertinent to multiracial groupings, Latinos share a common cultural experience of colonial oppression. The social consequences fostered shared values that permeate the family, religious institutions, and culture [21]. This enables a common sense of reality that amounts to a distinctive Latino phenomenon. It approximates values and perspectives that shape their worldview. Furthermore, such approximations existed, parallel to those that emerged over time in response to colonial oppression. The consequences were chronicled in the classic research regarding discrimination. All matters considered, it would appear then that the issue of race—implied by skin color—is a national contradiction as to the social stratification of Latin-American society [1]. Some insist Latinos are completely color blind and integrated. Others maintain there is a subtle hierarchy. By local standards, race is not determined to be as important a measure of social status as is class among Latino-Americans [1]. Conversely, there is also a direct correlation between dark skin and lower socioeconomic status as with dark-skinned Dominican Latino immigrants in the United States and Puerto Rico. Furthermore, in descriptive terminology, Latinos communicate a significant number of lexicons for the designation of skin color variation [1]. For example, *mulatto*, *moreno*, and *trigueno*, while common among Latino-Americans, are uncommon in North America and elsewhere.

Data collected from Mexicans, Mexican Americans, Spanish-speaking Americans, and Euro-American subjects in recent decades have verified high rejection rates of these groups toward darker-skinned, victim-group populations. That rejection is especially prominent among Mexican Americans living in rural areas.

As expected, Ellwyn Stoddard's classic study of Mexican intermarriage evokes the most dramatic manifestation of skin color discrimination. Attitude studies of Mexican Americans in Bakersfield, Los Angeles, and San Antonio further confirm these findings, with all groups overwhelmingly opposing intermarriage with darker-skinned African-Americans. In a recent study, Loomis measured rejection rates of

African-Americans in four categories—in marriage, as neighbors, as co-workers, and on the matter of gaining citizenship via naturalization. Among those who responded to the survey/questionnaire, 89% of Euro-Americans rejected African-Americans by marriage, 62% of Spanish-speaking respondents did the same, as did 59% of urban Mexicans, and 78% of the rural Mexicans who were questioned. As neighbors, African-Americans were rejected by 50% of the Euro-American respondents, by 45% of the Spanish-speaking respondents, by 43% of the urban Mexicans, and by 71% of the rural Mexicans. As co-workers, African-Americans were rejected by 21% of the Euro-American respondents, 8% of the Spanish-speaking respondents, 39% of the urban Mexicans, and 70% of the rural Mexicans. Lastly, African-Americans were rejected for becoming citizens via naturalization by Euro-Americans 5% of the time, by Spanish-speaking 4% of the time, by urban Mexicans 41% of the time, and by rural Mexicans 74% of the time. Given the lack of any significant historical confrontations between Mexican and African-Americans, the rejection of dark-skinned African-Americans by lighter-skinned Mexican Americans is arguably attributable to Western domination—discrimination [22].

There are marked differences between older and younger Mexican Americans regarding dark skin. Older persons who struggled for citizenship give less priority to skin color than do the youth. Furthermore, until recently it was common for Mexican Americans to trace their ancestry by way of their Hispano genes [22]. The widespread need among the younger generations to idealize their “superior” Euro blood is an extension of some historians who ascribe whiteness to the Aztec civilization. Once a person of color has idealized light skin in such ways, they develop a negative self-concept; such intense self-hatred inevitably produces feelings of inferiority. This commonly begins prior to grade school, with the acceptance of dark skin as a sign of inferiority, according to Kenneth and Mamie Clark—who conducted the landmark “doll” studies that led to American school desegregation. Based upon their research, children begin to internalize negative perceptions of dark skin as early as 3 years of age [16]. Furthermore, research confirms that individuals habitually ascribe badness to blackness and goodness to whiteness, as does every current Western dictionary. Seeing dark objects as smaller and seeing light objects as larger than they actually are and other positive or negative color evaluations begin in early childhood. Thus, having a darker skin color can result in Mexican self-hatred that is consistent with adverse effects on the victim’s self-image and personal motivation. When opportunities are consistently offered to lighter-skinned, Mexican Americans in the larger society, darker-skinned Mexican Americans experience despair. It is evident in the anecdotes of Chicano youth:

The teenage boys said there wasn’t much use of finishing High School if you are dark. . . you couldn’t get a good job anyway. Mexican girls who recently graduated from High School reported that they had many difficulties in finding secretarial or clerical jobs in the Castroville and Salinas area. They said that girls who looked almost white got jobs first but that some of the Mexican-looking girls never did find the kind of employment they sought and finally had to go to work in the sheds of the local packing company [22].

Skin color discrimination among Mexican American, Chicanos, and other Latino-Americans is a form of discrimination that disrupts group cohesion and sets up a myriad of group complications, including those within marital relations. Adult parents wonder whether children of mixed marriages will be rejected or not by either the dark-skinned or the light-skinned parent. Some Mexican American girls admit that they spurned Euro-American boyfriends for fear they would have to choose between identifying with a dark-skinned offspring and maintaining acceptance by their light-skinned spouse [22]. This attitude is not localized to Latino-Americans, but is dramatically displayed in Latinos who discriminate against other Latinos, as seen in litigation.

By the 1980s and early 1990s, the EEOC was confronted by an average of fewer than 500 skin color discrimination lawsuits per year. By 2002, it was confronted by almost 1400, which was about 3% of discrimination lawsuits in total. EEOC personnel contend that a significant number of such cases are skin color cases brought by members of victim-group populations. Thus, since 1985 to the turn of this century, the EEOC has gone to court more than 19 times on such cases and settled others outside of court. In fact, in the recent past, the EEOC tried a complaint from a Mexican restaurant manager in San Antonio, Texas. Ironically, it was on behalf of a white worker, who contends he was forced by the restaurant's Latino ownership to discriminate against Mexican waiters on the basis of skin color. According to facts in the case, the white manager testified that the Mexican American restaurant owner told him not to allow "dark-skinned" Latinos to work in the dining room. The manager resigned his position and complained to the EEOC. The EEOC fought and won the case, requiring the Latino-American restaurant owner to pay \$100,000 in court-ordered fines [23].

Perhaps one of the first cases of discrimination litigation, brought in 1981 by Latino people of color, was that of the dark-skinned Felix—the plaintiff—versus lighter-skinned Marquez—the defendant. The case was litigated in the US District Court of the District of Columbia. Both the plaintiff and the defendant were Latino-American employees of the Office of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in Washington, D.C. (OCPRW). The plaintiff alleges that the defendant did not promote her, citing skin color discrimination. At trial, the plaintiff introduced the personnel cards of 28 of her former fellow employees. She testified that, among them, only two were as dark or darker in color than she. All other employees in the office, according to the plaintiff, were light-skinned. Other highly credible evidence presented to the court suggested, however, that she might have been in error. The plaintiff's own skin color, which she described as "dark olive," appeared to the court to be a medium shade. The court sought testimony from the two dark-skinned employees. One dark-skinned employee did not appear, so the court had no evidence of their color other than the plaintiff's testimony. On the other hand, the second did appear and, although that employee considered their race to be Puerto Rican, their color would cause them to be identified in the continental United States as African-American. Two other witnesses described by the plaintiff as light-skinned, appearing to the court to be of a shade quite similar to the plaintiff'. These observations tended to contradict the placement of a rigid skin color line between employees, drawn

by the plaintiff in her testimony and reflect the fact that a substantial number of Latino-Americans are of mixed racial ancestry. Of the 28 employees whose personnel history cards were introduced into evidence, it was apparent that 18 were office and clerical employees. As with the defendant, the plaintiff was not entitled to a promotion in grade by virtue of her position, qualifications, seniority, and/or length of service. The evidence showed that her employer awarded promotions in grade based upon criteria that were neutral with respect to skin color. Employees whose color was as dark or darker than the plaintiff were given promotions in grade, while many other employees who were lighter than she were given infrequent promotions, or no promotions at all. Similar neutrality with respect to skin color was evident in the promotions in grade among employees throughout the entire agency. Based upon the rules of legal proceeding, the OCPRW did not discriminate against the plaintiff on account of her color in failing to recommend her for a promotion in grade. Thus, the court decided that the plaintiff was not promoted in grade for legitimate business reasons, having nothing whatever to do with her skin color [24].

Felero versus Stryker, a case brought later by Latino-Americans on the island of Puerto Rico, was litigated in 1998 in the US District Court of the District of Puerto Rico. Felero, the plaintiff, is a dark-skinned male while Rigoberto, the corporation defendant, is a light-skinned male. The plaintiff claims he was terminated from his job on the basis of having dark skin. The defendant contends that the plaintiff did not establish that his replacement by someone who was not within the protected class. The defendant further stated that the plaintiff's job had not been filled by anyone, but admits one of his areas of work was assigned to another employee. Thus, direct evidence of skin color discrimination was lacking.

In *McDonnell Douglas Corporation v. Green*, absent direct evidence of skin color discrimination, the court took the position that plaintiff must employ a familiar burden-shifting method. In the first instance, the plaintiff bears the initial burden of establishing a prima facie case of Title VII discrimination. In other words, the plaintiff had to show that he (a) was within a protected class, (b) was qualified to perform his duties, (c) was terminated, and (d) was replaced by a person from outside the protected class. The burden then shifts to the defendant to produce a valid and nondiscriminatory reason for the dismissal. The employer needed enough evidence to enable a rational fact finder to conclude that there existed a nondiscriminatory reason for the challenged employment action. Lastly, the burden shifted back to the plaintiff to show that the defendant's stated reason is but a mere pretext for discrimination. This, in turn, requires that the plaintiff proffer enough competent evidence to support two separate findings: that the defendant's reason was pretext and that its true motive was discrimination on the basis of skin color. In sum, while the fourth element of prima facie had been established, the court decided that no reasonable trier of fact could conclude from the evidence in the record, when viewed in the light most favorable to plaintiff, that the defendant discriminated against the plaintiff on the basis of his skin color. Therefore, the court granted the defendant's motion for summary judgment. Additionally, after dismissing the plaintiff's foundational federal claims, the court reassessed its jurisdiction over the supplemental state claims. Thus, in the exercise of its discretion, and after balancing the competing factors,

the court declined to exercise jurisdiction over the plaintiff’s supplemental claims. The plaintiff’s state law claims were then dismissed without prejudice [25]. While the Latino-American plaintiffs who filed the preceding litigation did not meet the judicial standards for obtaining judgments in their favor, the mere fact of their filing alone is evidence of an existing problem with skin color discrimination.

As with the aforementioned cases and a social environment permeated by a variety of Western influences, Latino-Americans have been no less susceptible to skin color discrimination. An effort to determine the existence of such denigration among Latinos was attempted by this author, using an instrument called the Cutaneo-Chroma Correlate (CCC), developed and previously pilot tested by myself. Using a sample of college students at one private and two public institutions, the following null hypothesis was formulated to provide a context for investigating the problem: “There is no relationship between skin color and selected values for skin color ideals.” The nonrepresentative sample consisted of 187 participants, conducted during the 1997–1998 school year, and selected from the registrar’s roster. Respondents had a mean age of 20 years. A self-reporting instrument available in Spanish was utilized for measuring their skin color. The CCC instrument was used to assess the relationship between skin color and various aspects of bias vis-à-vis sections “A,” “B,” and “C” [26]. Section “B” (of the CCC) was used here to assess the respondent’s personal values pertaining to skin color. Table 6.1 shows differentiating responses: A

Table 6.1 Cutaneo Chroma Correlate: Sección “B”: Evaluar demandado valores personales relativos a la idealización de piel clara

	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
Sección B	Más claro	Claro	Medio	Oscuro	Más oscuro
Instrucciones:					
Instrucciones: Sección “B” comprende 15 categorías diseñadas para demostrar los valores personales del participante. Usando los códigos anteriores, exprese sus preferencias sobre los Latinos, marcando en negro en la hoja de respuestas la que mejor describe su opinión. (A)- más claro, (B)- claro, (C)- medio, (D)- oscuro, (E)- más oscuro.					
1. Piel bonita es:					
2. El color de piel de una mujer bonita es:					
3. El color de piel del hombre que a la mujer le gusta es:					
4. Desearía que mi color de piel fuera:					
5. El color de piel de un Latino inteligente es:					
6. El color de piel de un Latino presuntuoso es:					
7. El color de piel de un Latino gentil es:					
8. El color de piel de mi mejor amigo es:					
9. Quiero que el color de piel de mis hijos sea:					
10. El color ideal de piel de mi compañero sería:					
11. El color de piel de mi familia debería ser:					
12. El color de piel de mi raza (Latino) debería ser:					
13. El color de piel de los Latinos físicamente fuertes es:					
14. El color de piel de los Latinos ignorantes es:					
15. El color ideal de piel de los compañeros de mis hijos es:					

Table 6.2 Resultados de Chroma Correlacionar Cutáneo, Sección B: Evaluación de los valores personales demandado en relación con la idealización de piel clara

Response								
	1 (%)	2 (%)	3 (%)	4 (%)	5 (%)	M	SD	N
Item								
1.	68.9	11.3	6.6	6.6	6.6	1.71	1.24	187
2.	14.2	20.8	19.8	20.8	24.5	3.21	1.39	187
3.	13.2	22.6	15.1	19.8	29.2	3.29	1.43	187
4.	5.7	7.5	5.7	30.2	50.9	4.13	1.17	187
5.	5.7	2.8	10.4	34.0	47.2	4.14	1.09	187
6.	9.4	8.5	14.2	23.6	44.3	3.85	1.33	187
7.	15.1	3.8	14.2	22.6	44.3	3.77	1.44	187
8.	2.8	4.7	8.5	31.1	52.8	4.26	1.00	187
9.	2.8	8.5	8.5	27.4	52.8	4.19	1.09	187
10.	1.9	7.5	8.5	30.2	51.9	4.23	1.02	187
11.	3.8	2.8	9.4	31.1	52.8	4.26	1.01	187
12.	15.1	21.7	12.3	17.9	33.0	3.32	1.50	187
13.	18.9	17.9	8.5	17.0	37.7	3.37	1.58	187
14.	40.6	11.3	5.7	17.9	24.5	2.75	1.69	187
15.	42.5	10.4	22.6	17.9	6.6	2.36	1.36	187

designation of lightest was noted as 5, light as 4, medium as 3, dark as 2, and darkest as 1. Responses themselves are contained in Table 6.2.

According to item 6, most students (68.9%) responded “dark skin” when questioned about pretty skin. This was a contradiction to items 7 through 18. The largest response to these items was overwhelmingly “light skin” (7]24.5%; 8]29.2%; 9]50.9%; 10]47.2%; 11]44.3%; 12]44.3%; 13]52.8%; 14]52.8%; 15]51.9%; 16]52.8%; 17]33.0%; and 18]37.7%). When questioned about the skin color of Latinos who are “dumb,” respondents overwhelmingly replied “dark skin” (19]40.6%). In glaring contrast, the same students responded “dark skin” (20]42.5%) when questioned about the projected ideal skin color of their children’s spouse. Referring to the aforementioned descriptive data, it would appear with some contradiction that light skin is ideally valued among respondents.

According to these data, the presumption of a relationship between skin color and selected values for skin color ideals is plausible. There are then implications for discrimination among Latino-Americans as a victim-group population pertaining to the perception of various skin colors. These findings would appear to contradict—or at least challenge—the presumption of Latino-American, intragroup harmony and racial tolerance. It also implies a reflection of continuing and pervasive racist attitudes toward persons characterized by dark skin. It is a bias that can be described as a variant of colonial racism as exhibited by Europeans toward people of color. In a group where whiteness is ideal, light skin invariably represents the standard. The scores of Latino-American students, on section “B” of the CCC test, suggested their tendency to appreciate selected ideals in self and others on the basis of color preferences. Such appreciation could be used to assess status and social worth, thereby

contributing to the perpetuation of skin color discrimination in an otherwise tolerant Latino-American social environment.

From a sociobiological perspective, Pierre L. Van den Berghe [27] insists the propensity for group loyalty is deeply rooted in genes. In fact, contrary to the Latino-American perspective, some would infer that skin color is stronger than class as a means of identification in group loyalty. Latino-Americans for the most part arrive in the United States carrying with them a history and cultural norms that serve victim-group discrimination by skin color. Once settled, they experience brutal forms of discrimination as members of a dark-skinned out-group whose assimilation potential is limited. Institutions critical to their well-being, including the police and judicial systems, have not assisted in Latino viability. In both instances Latino-Americans responded in kind, manifesting various forms of victim-group discrimination both socially and legally, being no less insidious than white racism. Their plight represents the norm for victim groups in America and will unfortunately delay resolution of discrimination into the foreseeable future.

References

1. Hall, R. (2003). *Discrimination among oppressed populations*. Lewiston, NY: Mellen.
2. Lee, S. (1993). Racial classification in the U.S. census: 1890–1990. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 16(1), 75–94.
3. Rodriguez, C., & Cordero-Guzman, H. (1992). Placing race in context. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 15(4), 523–542.
4. Congress, R. (1987). *The Afro-Nicaraguans*. Atlanta, GA: Atlanta Committee on Latin America.
5. Stamp, K. M. (1956, 1989). *The peculiar institution: slavery in the ante-bellum south*. New York: Vintage Books.
6. Hernton, C. (1965). *Sex and discrimination in America*. New York: Grove.
7. Casavantes, E. (1970). Pride and prejudice: a Mexican American dilemma. *Civil Rights Digest*, 3(1), 22–27.
8. Rodriguez, R. (1977). Awareness of multicultural language and learning styles research: an urging. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication. Kansas, Missouri. (ERIC# ED 147 862).
9. Ramierz, A., & Lasater, T. (1977). Ethnicity of communicator, self-esteem, and reactions to fear arousing communication. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 102(1), 79–91.
10. Cole, G. F., (1989). *The American system of criminal justice*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks Cole.
11. Staples, B. (1999). When the “paranoids” turn out to be right. *Times Fax*, Editorial, 8.
12. Fried, J. (May 7, 1999). In Louima’s first day on stand, he tells of brutal police assault. *New York Times*, A 1(2).
13. Hall, R. (2002). Pseudo-racism among Chicano(a), Asian and African Americans: implications of the black/white dichotomy. *Social Science Journal*, 39, 109–112.
14. Fernandes, F. (1972). *O negro no mundo dos bancos*. São Paulo, Brazil: Difusao Europeia do Livro.
15. Harvey, R. (1995). The issue of skin color in psychotherapy with African Americans. *Families in Society*, 76 (1), 3–10.
16. Russell, K., Wilson, M., & Hall, R. E. (1992). *The Color Complex: the “last taboo” among African Americans*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
17. Okazawa-Rey, M., Robinson, T. R., Ward, J. V. (1987). Black women and the politics of skin color and hair. *Women and Therapy*, 6(1/2), 89–102.

18. Sciara F. J. (1983). Skin color and college student prejudice. *College Student Journal*, 17, 390–394.
19. Levine, E. S., & Padilla, A. M. (1980). *Crossing cultures in therapy*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
20. Feagin, J. & Feagin, C. (1996). *Racial and ethnic relations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
21. Moa, J. (1988). An ethnographic study regarding values: Puerto Rican students in the bilingual program in Willimantic, Connecticut. Dissertation Abstracts International: the Humanities and Social Sciences, 48(10), 2735–A.
22. Stoddard, E. (1973). *Mexican Americans*. New York: Random House.
23. Valbrun, M. (2003). EEOC sees rise in intrarace complaints of color bias. *Wall Street Journal*. Eastern Edition, New York, p. B1.
24. *Felix v. Marquez* (1980). WL 242, 24 Empl. Prac. Dec. P 31, 279 (D.C., Sept. 11, 1980) (NO. 78–2314).
25. *Falero v. Stryker*, 10F Supp. 2d 93 (U.S. Dist. Puerto Rico 1998).
26. Hall, R. E. (1990). The projected manifestations of aspiration, personal values, and environmental assessment cognates of cutaneo-chroma (skin color) for a selected population of African Americans (Doctoral dissertation, Atlanta University, 1989). Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, 3363A.
27. van den Berghe, P., & Frost, P. (1986). Skin color preference, sexual dimorphism and sexual selection: a case of gene culture co-evolution? *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 9 (1), 87–113.

Chapter 7

Native Americans: Manifestations of White Influences

Currently, Native Americans represent approximately a fraction of 1% of the US population. That representation is minute compared to their numbers when European settlers arrived in the Americas from Europe. Today, some Natives reside in urban areas, such as Minneapolis and San Francisco, while others are inclined to live out their lives on reservation lands set aside by the US federal government. While the term Native American is used in reference to a particular population, they are in fact a very distinct and diverse assemblage characterized by a unique set of cultures, and languages, previous to the New World era.

Historical evidence suggests that before white settlers arrived, with some exceptions, Native Americans were for the most part a peaceful and tolerant people who willingly accepted all members of humanity as being equal. Their domination by the newly arrived European settlers meant that racial tolerance regarding those characterized by dark-skinned and/or African features would be short lived. While they are no less a victim-group population, who have endured various forms of discrimination as people of color, Native Americans today may act out victim-group discrimination as a manifestation of the victimism brought by settlers from Europe. As with other victim-group populations, Native Americans under the circumstances have internalized the practice of discrimination as an acceptable and/or tolerable American norm. In the aftermath of pressures to assimilate and other Euro-American influences, they too accepted denigration of dark skin and class divisions. Given the limited access of scholars to the social investigation of Native American populations, such influence regarding victim-group discrimination is all but inaccessible. The most dramatic evidence that discrimination exists is rooted in the documentation of American history.

The Native American's tolerance for other peoples is apparent in the historical accounts of the Cherokee Nation. The fact that many Americans both black and white can trace their ancestry through Cherokee bloodlines is attributable to the Cherokee's initial acceptance of different variations of mankind. Dark-skinned populations were equally accepted prior to Western domination and other forms of influence. However, during and in the aftermath of slavery, that tolerance for human diversity would be extinguished for the more racist, discriminatory practices, most relative to the enslavement of dark-skinned Africans.

Some form of slavery significantly impacted Cherokee life during the dawn of the New World. In the beginning, white settlers from Europe enslaved both Native and African-Americans, as their labor was required to tend the crops and farmland of the emerging civilization. Historical accounts document Native enslavement as early as the 1500s, by De Soto and other Spaniards, many having been bound to Spanish slavery as a consequence of war. The ability to enslave Native Americans was rationalized by the Spanish as necessary so that they might Christianize otherwise heathen forms of mankind. The British and French also rationalized Native American slavery for the same reasons. But despite their power and influence upon Native Americans, the Cherokee were initially not as comfortable with the practice as their white, settler counterparts. The fact that they objected influenced white settlers to press even more for its institutionalization. The controversy between the two groups can be substantiated in recorded rhetoric in 1760, during the Cherokee War in North Carolina: "...those who could capture 'an enemy Indian,' could hold him in slavery" [1]. The practical worth of this law is reflected in the need for slavery in a state where the tobacco crop was an economic mainstay. Thus, eventually Native Americans both owned slaves and were enslaved simultaneously themselves. That included full-blooded Cherokees and so-called half-breeds. However, the Native version of slavery differed significantly from the typical Southern version. Furthermore, the common act of slavery throughout the world was much less brutal than that in North America and what the Cherokee had envisioned. In fact, those in bondage in the American South found themselves reduced to the status of animals, completely devoid of their humanity. Slavery under the Cherokee imposed upon a slave's freedom, but he was otherwise still considered human. He was less likely to be bought by his Cherokee master, but was instead more often the victim of war. Others such as blacks might be enslaved after escaping from white plantations, which more often than not made the slave a willing participant. Their lives among the Cherokee and other Native Americans, being much more humane than the white Southern version, are verified through romantic alliances between black male slaves and Native American women. From such unions a new population of humanity emerged, called by folk terms the "red-black Cherokee," existing only in this New World. While red-black Cherokee existed in formidable numbers, their representation in historic literature of American slavery is conspicuously absent.

The more humane nature of Native American slavery meant that the Cherokee and their slaves might work together, literally side by side. The unions between the two groups, which resulted in red-black offspring, were often validated by marriage. But despite the more humane form of bondage initially under the Cherokee, the enslaved were in fact not free. Slavery in some form appealed to their Cherokee masters because it was profitable, particularly in areas like North Carolina where farming was the primary economy. Not only did the Cherokee own African slaves but Euro-Americans as well found themselves under the auspices of Native American ownership [1]. This is a fact of American history, overlooked as much as Cherokee slave masters. White slaves owned by Cherokee masters were treated with the same humanity as blacks. Under the circumstances, the beginning of integration might have existed, but made illegal by white law. For example, in some

lower-class churches during services African, Native, and Euro-Americans might pray together without respect for their racial differences. As an example, historic documents record that two black slaves were seen teaching their Cherokee mistresses to read the Bible [1]. Teaching a slave to read was tantamount to illegal in many locations. The fact that they might be found giving instructions to a member of the slave master class is a dramatic illustration of how significantly Native American slavery differed from the white version.

Most Euro-Americans did not approve of the manner in which the Cherokee treated their slaves because it threatened the institution. They were not indifferent to the nondiscriminatory behaviors that might take place in church. And while in the beginning the Cherokee presented themselves as equal to the white man, in fact, their conduct of business was ever mindful of white reactions. Thus, a Native American slave owner named Shoe Boots married his favorite slave, a dark-skinned girl named Lucy. Their union produced two red-black children, to whom Shoe Boots wanted to award freedom. To do so, he petitioned the tribal Chief. Freedom for the children was granted, but Shoe Boots was admonished by the local Chief not to request such freedom again because doing so might cause unnecessary problems with the white man [2]. By the eighteenth century, Native Americans had subsequently subjected themselves to the dictates of the dominant white culture. Their initial humane attitude toward Africans, that is, dark-skinned people, more and more began to reflect the influences of dominant-group discrimination. The fact that Shoe Boots' children by a black slave wife could have been dark-skinned, and likely made little difference initially, began to evidence a change in attitudes. In the aftermath, Native Americans were given to Euro-American dominance that would make them amenable to victim-group discrimination by the denigration of dark skin.

As the white version of slavery became more acceptable among Native Americans, due to the dominant influence of the former, human bondage among Native Americans became more commonplace, particularly in the South where the Cherokee lived. Evidence of this commonality is suggested by the fact that, in addition to blacks and whites, the Cherokee held their own people in bondage as well. The enslavement of Native Americans by Native Americans is further evidence of the less brutal nature of the Native version. But the implication for Native American victimism is apparent in the level of influence and prestige white settlers had gradually assumed in the minds of the Cherokee people. While they obviously treated their slaves with more humanity, they also began to see blacks in particular as having a lower status. This change in perspective was useful in that, about the time the South began to rise, the growth in the numbers of Cherokee farmers required that they make greater use of black slaves to attend to their crops. Such an increase also resulted in an increased number of red-black offspring as well.

As history records, by 1824 more than 1000 black slaves were known to both reside and work alongside their Cherokee masters. According to US Census data a decade later, that same number had increased to 1500. An increase to 1500 was not necessarily a huge measure by today's population standards, but then it would have had a significant impact upon the red-black population and would have made them formidable. Their numbers would have the affect of competing with the

full-blooded population, which created a visual vehicle for distinction by skin color. Mixed-blooded Cherokees including red-blacks were considered apart from the full bloods, which accommodated the potential to polarize the Native American community. However, given to the humanity of Native Americans, polarization was not easily reached. While the community engaged in slavery, not all Native Americans condoned it. The fact that slaves were generally accorded more humane treatment by Cherokee masters may be a result of the universal feeling among Natives that slavery introduced in the South was simply an overall assault upon humanity. But they struggled with it because they were powerless to confront the white settler power structure. In addition, slavery was not a normal course of reality for Native Americans, leaving many to great difficulty associated with its complexity. While they may have thought slavery to be wrong, Native Americans never failed to address matters of slavery in a manner that was sure to bring Southern white approval. This approval is illustrated when, in 1819, they announced the following: "...no contract or bargain entered into with any slave or slaves, without the consent of their masters shall be binding on them" [2].

Sometime later, Native Americans agreed that no citizen could purchase any materials or products from a slave unless they obtained permission first from the slave's master to do so. That meant that a slave was not given an opportunity to sell alcohol that they might make or other crafts they might produce by their own labor without the owner's permission. Initially such policies appear to suggest that the attitudes of Native Americans had begun to decline in their humanity toward slaves. It may also suggest that what was being denied regarding privileges had existed before 1819.

Increased contact with the white settler community meant that, nearing the Civil War where slavery was the primary issue, Native Americans were not in a position politically or militarily to object or in any way influence the treatment of slaves and/or black people. This is not to imply that Native Americans should be dismissed from their responsibility for slavery, but implies that the association is worth noting. In the context of the Southern plantation class influence and otherwise domination, the Cherokee attitude toward their dark-skinned cohort changed dramatically and contributed to the general discrimination that would later divide the Native community by skin color and change their attitude toward African-Americans and other dark-skinned people, including the new mixed-blood Native American offspring.

Although the red-black population was substantial at one time, there has not been commensurate attention paid by American scholars to their plight. Given the existing colonial mentality, such an oversight should not come as a surprise. However, with some exception—including the works of William Loren Katz, author of *Black Indians: A Hidden Heritage*—there has been an attempt by American historians to tell their story and give account of the Cherokee and reference to their "black-blood-half-breed brothers" [2]. Some bias is apparent, perhaps given that historical documentation emphasizes Native Americans as members of a proud nation, which had its own set of beliefs and moral traditions. Africans, from which red-black Cherokee descend, were characterized as merely nameless, cultureless slaves who were little more than animals but for white influence. As members of humanity,

they in effect, did not exist, as was suggested in the works of Ralph Ellison [3]. Historically, little mention is ever made about Native Americans, who were enslaved, and nearly nothing is mentioned about cultural similarities between Native American and African-American slaves. As an integral part of colonial strategy, this omission was critical in keeping both victim groups divided. Thus, the mass migration of white settlers from Europe could be accomplished with the least amount of resistance and/or difficulty.

As much as Native Americans objected to white culture and its moral traditions, especially as pertains to the treatment of black people, they could not escape white influence. This influence was in fact a form of domination, which eventually predisposed them to victim-group discrimination. Having complete control of historical records, white historians to a considerable extent have failed to include the participation of Cherokee Native Americans in their discussions of the discrimination that took place in the antebellum South. In 1920, a black historian named Carter G. Woodson commented on the relationship between blacks and Native Americans as: "...one of the longest unwritten chapters in the history of the United States" [4]. As an African-American, Woodson was an exception who maintained the insight and courage to acknowledge an aspect of American history in which white scholarship of his time was either not interested or did not understand. To illustrate the point, a book entitled: *The Negro Cowboys*, by Philip Durham and Everett L. Jones, is mainly an objective and factually accurate study. Unfortunately, their labeling African-Americans who joined alliances with Native Americans in battle as "renegades" is misleading. "Renegade" is a medieval term that was made fashionable in early Hollywood films, meaning someone prone to terrorism as a vicious, bloodthirsty killer. Many Americans came to accept such media images as factually accurate. In the aftermath of provocative tales, it was then taken for granted, despite the fact that, for every African-American who was labeled a renegade and joined forces to fight against the white community, a few others sided with the white community and soldiers to fight against Native Americans. This suggests that the relationship between African and Native Americans was not given to any absolute alliance. They obviously were not accepted by Euro-Americans and, in many cases, met with initial indifference by Native Americans until such time it could be established that they indeed had a mutual interest and common foe. What is more, the manner in which Durham and Jones addressed the relationship between African and Native Americans is a biased account, which underestimates the number of African-Americans who took up arms with Native Americans against white settlers. By tacitly romanticizing African-Americans who fought against Native Americans, it also suggests that African-Americans would have preferred to remain loyal to their white slave masters than to fight for freedom.

As bias is not unusual, the biased account of African-American and Native American alliances by white historians should not be regarded in any way as exceptional. The aforementioned bias is more likely to be a by-product of discrimination exercised by the colonial mentality. As a result, the works of Durham and Jones cannot be assessed as uniquely culpable. However, in a scholarly sense it is susceptible to legitimate criticism in that the lack of an objective frame reduces their works to

little more than historical folly. Additionally, white historians cannot be blamed for writing their accounts of history from the perspective of Euro-Americans. However, the fact that such historians were indeed allowed the status and esteem of objective scholars, immune to political bias, is grounds for legitimate criticism. Thus, rather than record the facts as they witnessed them, many historians took to writing about a slaveholding, Indian killing class that had ceased to exist decades ago. Perhaps most tragic of all is the fact that critical truths omitted by white historians about black and Native American alliances, having been deemed by them as virtually irrelevant, may be far more damaging than the biased distortions. They are facts that can never be retrieved by any other than the testimony of participants or eyewitnesses. Unlike fabrications and biases that can be disproved, discredited, or challenged by references to historical documents, once facts are omitted they are lost forever. Subsequently, artists who make attempts to portray historical scenes may then represent such scenes in an acutely distorted manner. This misrepresentation further facilitates distortion and what they distort drives significant facts further beyond the scope of actuality. For example, artist George Catlin [5] painted impressive portraits of the Seminole Chief Osceola, who had been held in captivity. What Catlin omitted in text and on canvas was mentioning that Osceola's personal bodyguard consisted of 55 warriors, which included 52 red-black Seminoles. Stereotype was not Catlin's interest. Catlin's goal was to record the colorful costumes, regalia, and Indian life. If Catlin never painted Osceola with the full band of bodyguards, he may not have been allowed to see it, or had no idea the bodyguard was comprised of a red-black, etc., especially if not dressed in costumes that caught his eye. Despite the fact, Catlin was exceptional in his genre. Thus, the issue may be his access to, not what he interpreted or omitted about, Native Americans. Their depiction would have more accurately portrayed the significance of the black and Native alliance. If frontier American artists, whose work was of stereotypical scenes, had illustrated the obvious and significant presence of African-Americans among Native warriors, the public record would have been served by its accuracy; instead, it was subjected to bias.

In an effort to minimize biased criticism, it must be acknowledged that the extent of distortion and omission could have been the results of well-intended historians who may have simply been confused. What they were exposed to did not differ from what the public observed. "Red-African Americans" did not appear in mainstream schoolbooks. They were not discussed in typical school history lectures. They also did not benefit from portrayals in novels or any other type of media representation. As a result of these omissions, what may have begun as a complimentary relationship between African-Americans and Native Americans for their mutual survival may in fact appear to have declined through ignorance, oversight, misrepresentation, or intended fabrication. Ultimately this served the tenets of discrimination, as Native American acceptance of Euro-American institutions including slavery contributed to their own demise. Thus, some Native Americans eventually came to reject red-black Indians as inferior, less than or someone to despise. As time progressed, such Natives—in particular those who had been "civilized" by the white community—expressed abhorrence and denigration for those who were characterized by dark

skin. Their abhorrence included not only blacks and red-blacks but full-blooded Native Americans as well. Native Americans then enabled their own demonization and the distortion of history by white scholars. Subsequently, generations of Americans came to think of life on the American frontier as a romantic tale of settlers who arrived from Europe and through hard work and determination carved a way out of the wilderness and brought civilization to the New World. Hollywood figures such as John Wayne reaped a considerable fortune with that portrayal. Wayne, in the role of rugged frontiersman or cowboy who pulled himself up by the bootstraps, was depicted in countless film scenes fighting Native Americans, who as fate would have it were always the “bad guys.” The American viewing public was not likely ever to question his motives or whether or not Native Americans were, in fact, an enemy. Such biased and distorted views are easily taken for granted by Americans when the status of American history is at stake. It then becomes necessary to rescue dignity by whatever means to secure national pride so as not to confront truths that must be denied. Such a strategy means that the many romantic battles portrayed as necessary to gain American freedom could be justified. Omitted are the numerous battles waged by African-Americans and Native Americans against imperialist settlers who fought and died for the same freedom, such as in New York, which occurred before the famous battle fought at Lexington and Concord, on April 19, 1775.

Accounts of this obscure battle are an illustration of the black and Native American alliance, which is also the description of an armed revolt. This revolt was a confrontation that involved many black slaves, red-blacks, and more than 500 full bloods. Their courage in battle was not dramatically “heard around the world,” as was said of the American Minutemen. But their willingness to offer their lives was equally worthy. The numerous battles fought in New York by Native Americans, African-Americans, and their red-black counterparts are a neglected example of some of the joint ventures by blacks, Natives, and mixed bloods that are so sparsely noted in American history. In fact, prior to the onset of colonization there existed numerous battles involving such intergroup alliances, which are in truth a significant aspect of the American story. The fact that such information has been overlooked has resulted in an ignorance of which the most informed and educated of blacks and Native Americans know little, including the fact that red-black Americans ever existed. The tendency to adhere to the one-drop theory of race has trivialized their contributions, apparent in some of the most notable of historical events, which ignore the Native heritage of prominent black figures such as Crispus Attucks.

“On the snowy night of March 5, 1770, Crispus Attucks, a black linked by blood to Native Americans, stepped dramatically into American history. He was the first to fall in the Boston Massacre” [1]. While many Americans are knowledgeable as to the bravery of Crispus Attucks, they are ignorant of his ancestry. Their ignorance is a result of an oversight in most traditional texts, wherein Attucks is represented as an African-American. That representation is little more than a half truth. His life is celebrated annually during Black History month as the great African-American hero that he was, but nowhere in the Native American community is he accorded

any degree of celebration—perhaps because being of mixed blood he is not considered by some to be truly Native American. Not free of white influence, modern Native Americans are thus more than likely given to the racial traditions, including discrimination, which limit their perception of who and what defines one as Native American. The inability to accurately acknowledge Attucks in the context of his Native heritage blemishes the worth of historical fact.

Another equally significant but forgotten red-black figure was Paul Cuffee. The factual neglect of Paul Cuffee is similar to that of Attucks in that he is described simply as a “black” man. In fact, as a red-black, he was of black and Massachusetts [Wampanoag] Native American heritage. He eventually succeeded in becoming a wealthy merchant and ship owner in early Massachusetts. His wife, Alice Pequit, was also a Native. Attucks and Cuffee are important in their moments, but may be seen as minor in a larger view. However, when the neglect of their Native American heritage is considered, the existence of a pattern is suggested. The overall outcome is to make less of all but contributions made by members of the mainstream population.

Red-black Cuffee is worthy of historical note, in large part due to his various forms of activism. He devoted much of his time and personal resources to help eliminate the overt racism and discrimination suffered by his dark-skinned African brethren. Much of it was de facto, as manifestation of accepted traditional norms. While Cuffee was of mixed blood, he was also discriminated against for having dark skin that implied his Africanness. His hair was not straight, as is Caucasian hair, nor were his other features as pronounced, but his dark skin left little doubt that he was a member of a despised inferior group. Despite the fact of his group status, Cuffee maintained superior personal wealth for his era and was known to possess superior intellect. He contributed to the Back-to-Africa movement, made famous by Marcus Garvey, and in 1815 Cuffee provided transportation at his own expense of approximately some 30 African-Americans back to their homeland in Africa.

In the modern era, Martin Luther King Jr. is among the most noted figures in black and American history. But King’s greatness was preceded by a red-black figure of equal significance, who engaged in a similar struggle for the freedoms of black people, Frederick Douglass. He is arguably the greatest orator of his time. Douglass was an abolitionist who was also a runaway slave. His mixed blood included not only Native American but white as well. But due to his dark skin, such heritage was in fact irrelevant and, in context of the one-drop theory of race, he was regarded as simply a black man. Not only was Douglass of mixed racial heritage but he was even more unique in that he was involved in an interracial marriage during the antebellum period. Although Douglass has received considerably more historical acknowledgement than many of his red-black counterparts, traditional mainstream texts have failed to mention the fact of his Native American heritage.

While modern historians are less likely to accept biased accounts of history, in previous eras their doing so was part of a deliberate strategy to maintain division among potential opposition forces to the white community. Leading historical scholars such as Theda Perdue, in her much quoted work of *Slavery and the Evolution of Cherokee Society*, have documented the situation [6]. “By emphasizing the actual,

exaggerated and imagined differences between Africans and Native Americans, whites successfully masked the cultural similarities of the two races as well as their mutual exploitation by whites" [6].

In this way, whites could more easily maintain control of land and wealth, including the development of the growing fur trade. Nevertheless, the natural bonds between African-Americans and Native Americans were known and exploited by whites. African-Americans were more likely to build a secure relationship with the Native American community because their word was their bond, unlike whites who Native Americans believed spoke with insincere, or forked, tongues. African-Americans, on the other hand, were more like Native Americans regarding such matters; so whites employed them for their trustworthiness, knowing that their word was their bond they would never break even to the extent of death.

While the alliances between blacks and Native Americans were strong, the alliances between whites and Native Americans also gained in strength. By the eighteenth century, Native Americans, including the Cherokee, were becoming more amenable to assimilation the more they came in contact with whites. Such contact did not always result in the best situation for their alliances with blacks. Thus, in 1789, one observer noted that the Cherokee Native American had evolved to the extent that many white settlers were confident that they were willing to assimilate by choice into the dominant white culture [1]. As a result of their relatively privileged relationship with whites, the Cherokee were also poised to internalize the influences of whites, including the discriminating attitudes and racist regards thought by whites of African-Americans. According to the antebellum naturalist and travel writer William Bartram: "if adopting or imitating the manners and customs of the white people is to be termed civilization, perhaps the Cherokee have made the greatest advance" [1]. Additionally, no less than the president of the United States, Theodore Roosevelt, said of the Cherokee that: "...the Cherokee were a bright, intelligent race, better fitted to 'follow the white man's road' than any other Indians" [1].

Native American Cherokees had illustrated a considerable degree of willingness to internalize prejudicial norms not exclusive of skin color. Thus, in assessing the role of skin color pertaining to discrimination among Native Americans, it is apparent that the Cherokee have, to a considerable degree, been conspicuously missing from the documented histories of the slaveholding antebellum South. This omission is apparent to anyone who has conducted serious research of the historical literature [1]. In the most widely read books concerning the antebellum American South, there is hardly any mention at all of the Cherokee role in Southern discrimination and even less of other Native Americans. When discrimination is discussed, it is with few exceptions attributed to the colonial objectives for control of American territories, involving France, Spain, and England. The impact of this oversight has resulted in a deep void of historical information regarding African-American slavery existing among Native Americans, such as the Cherokee, and the associated prejudicial behaviors. Had such information been included, the acts of victim-group discrimination might have reached acknowledgment at the time they occurred.

Regarding acts of Cherokee discrimination, their tribal culture was one of the most ready-to-internalize Western assimilation. After the initial alliances between African-Americans and Native Americans, the influences of white cultures upon Native traditions were not irrelevant to later interactions with dark-skinned groups. As a product of antebellum norms, the stereotype of darker-skinned African-Americans as an inferior lot thus gained acceptance among Native Americans who had previously taken part in alliances with the same. Considerable population size and cultural sophistication made their willingness to discriminate on the basis of skin color a more potent social event. They were grist for prejudicial behavior, given that prior to white influence they had already assumed themselves superior to all, regardless of tribe, skin color/race, or national origin [1]. It is reasonable to assume that this belief contributed much to the willingness of the Cherokee to adopt the ways of whites, whom they came to view as equally superior. After observing such superior whites in the exercise of power over enslaved Africans, including the Spanish and French, the inferiority of dark-skinned peoples was more acceptable. Unfortunately, after observing Africans in chains, the Cherokee had not considered the moral implications of slavery. Ironically at some point, Cherokee Native Americans who evidenced long held views of their own superiority came to accept that whites were superior even to themselves.

The cultures of the various Native American tribes differed significantly, from warriors to farmers to nomads. It was difficult for whites to label the Cherokee Natives as savages because they maintained a National Council that was managed, for the most part, by educated, white-mixed-blood tribesmen. The white-mixed-blood members were significant in that they practiced a value system that was in many ways similar to that of the antebellum slave traders. They maintained an impressive school system that unsurprisingly operated almost identically to those of white systems, where Native American youth could internalize white values at an early age. Among such Cherokee, mixed blood was more the norm, as it was likely that full-blood Cherokees were both darker-skinned and a minority in proportion. The ultimate objective of such schools was that, by enabling the “refinement” of their daughters, the young women might become more like whites and thus serve as dutiful wives in the Cherokee Nation. Refining darker-skinned, full-blooded Cherokees presented a unique set of problems. Native American schools could not exclude them, but they were at a loss as to the potential for assimilation. Thus, about 1871, if the darker-skinned, full bloods could not afford to pay for education after being pressured by disgruntled tribesmen, it was decided that a department would be set up to educate them free of charge [1].

The darker-skinned Cherokee were normally of less wealth than their lighter-skinned counterparts. However, the very wealthy among the lighter-skinned were not as numerous as might be assumed. While, unlike the darker-skinned, most could pay for their educations, but they were not typically among the nation’s legitimate upper class. Even so, many were wealthy enough to attend schools outside the Cherokee Nation. Their desire to do so may have been influenced by the tribe’s decision to educate the darker-skinned full bloods free of charge. As could be expected, by 1851–1856 a class system within the tribe had evolved based upon wealth.

However, from 1872 to 1910, class status had begun to operate more on the basis of racial characteristics such as skin color, where light was idealized and dark skin denigrated. Other racial traits implied status as well including white blood quantum, physical appearance (Native or Caucasian), and apparent degree of refinement assumed by assimilation [1].

It was not long before white influences were evident among the Native American Cherokee. In the behavior of the wealthier students, both they and their teachers were known to take pride in their light skin. Within the school setting, such students frequently taunted full bloods, darker-skinned by their biological heritage. The full bloods themselves, while victims, were not immune to taunting others in that they looked down on those who displayed less knowledge of white ways. It was taken for granted that the lighter-skinned, mixed-blood students were the superior group being closer to white and that the full-blood girls accepted that they were “a little bit backward,” which gave them inferior status. The results facilitated victim-group discrimination not only on the basis of skin color but class, wealth, education, and many other victimism factors.

References to the historical accounts of victimism among Native American Cherokees are dramatic. Wealth among dark-skinned Cherokees did not always compromise the extent of their being discriminated against. In one instance, a five-sixteenths Cherokee student was admonished by a lighter-skinned school mate for her desire to take part in a class play, “[a]ngels are fair-haired and you are too dark for an angel.” The same taunting can be found in various forms of print media. One such example occurred in an 1855 issue of the annual anthology, *A Wreath of Cherokee Rose Buds*. In this issue, students took issue with an editorial about the Townsend, Massachusetts, female seminary’s paper, the *Lesbian Wreath*. Reportedly, Cherokee girls were referred to as “dusky sisters.” Offended, the Cherokee girls immediately responded with stories of their own, depicting themselves in appearance by such white traits as blue eyes. In one such tale a student writes: “Fun and abundance peeped from her blue eyes. . . and the crimson blush stole upon her cheeks.” Writing in the same issue, another portrayal is of a “fair, gay, blue-eyed girl. . .,” [a] “fairylike creature with auburn hair.” Lastly, a student wrote in a story, entitled *Two Companions*, of a girl named Hope, who is described as “the very personification of loveliness” with a “tiny, blue-eyed child” named Faith. As is well known, among Native Americans the genetic trait of having blue eyes does not exist naturally, but it was idealized in Cherokee literature as the essence of beauty and poise in the aftermath of white domination [1].

As indicated in the literature of Cherokee students, those who graduated from the color-conscious tribal institutions were quite assimilated. To that end, the schools they attended were successful in producing graduates who were otherwise victims of discrimination and who would become amenable to acting out discrimination against other victim-group populations. After leaving school, they gravitated toward select professions including teaching or medicine. Part of their tradition also included “marrying well,” which meant marrying white men or men who had less Native American heritage than they. When they could not locate such men, they would settle for husbands who were physicians, politicians, or members of

prominent (usually wealthy) Cherokee Native American families. Usually, the more white blood a Cherokee woman had suggested that she would have had lighter skin. Having lighter skin meant that she was more likely to marry a white man, a tribal member with higher social status, or a man whose degree of white blood at least equaled hers. As time elapsed, such Native Americans as the Cherokee have shown little objection to the assimilation traditions of the white community, including race select marital patterns [7]. Today, it is manifested in various ways as victim-group discrimination.

Sociological investigations of discrimination consistently focus upon manifestations between African-Americans as victims and Euro-Americans as perpetrators, that is, the “black/white” dichotomy [8]. In the modern era, that dichotomy has become all but irrelevant. Regarding Native Americans, the implications of discrimination have not been acknowledged because it is so politically volatile and infinitely more complex than that between blacks and whites. In the milieu of mascot and treaty issues, investigation into the implications of discrimination among Native Americans is thus seemingly less urgent. Conversely, in the elimination of all social problems it is incumbent upon scholars to investigate the incidents of discrimination beyond the traditional black/white dichotomy, which may in fact serve the elimination of other social pathologies that include and extend beyond those associated with Native Americans [9].

Akin to the elimination of discrimination as it pertains to modern-day Native Americans is the stigmatization and denigration of groups characterized by dark skin, including African-Americans. Succinctly put, the issue of discrimination relative to Native American victimism will be more contingent upon skin color than race in the aftermath of Euro-American domination [10]. Skin color will therefore allow for deviations from the black/white dichotomy and similar constructs that are deemed less relevant.

Pathology of the Native American psyche discrimination has prevailed as arguably among the nation’s most devastating and tenacious social problems [11]. Volumes of literature and research have added little to facilitate its demise, pertaining to all Americans and not one separate group. Contributing to ignorance is the fact that for decades, discrimination has been portrayed in a politically correct context as scholars fear treading upon sensitive intellectual domain. Discrimination is in fact a psychosocial behavioral event directed at people of color as well as by people of color via a myriad of manifestations—and particularly aimed at African-Americans vis-à-vis skin color [12]. There should be no doubt as to the accuracy of this assumption. Notwithstanding, to then characterize discrimination in a narrow black/white context does not facilitate accurate research outcomes. It enables the otherwise denigration of humanity and the belief that within a single species of the same genetic structure some are superior. While it might be more considerate to overlook victim-group discrimination, it cannot be justified via scholarship. Thus, while reference to Native American discrimination may not be popular or politically correct, it is a requirement of prudent research [13].

Antonio Gramsci offers a useful modern-day reference for the illumination of this issue among Native Americans residing in the San Francisco Bay Area. This area

boasts one of the largest concentrations of urban Native Americans in the country, which came about as the result of relocation programs during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s. In the aftermath of such urbanization, those who relocated experienced increased associations with dominant Euro-American ethnicity. Thus, socially they exemplified a progression in assimilation and acculturation to the dominant-group mainstream. In the aftermath, Native American urbanization distorted the multiplicity of individual tribal identities into one monolithic population characterized as Native American. This postbellum social dynamic enabled a Native American conglomerate that pushed African-mixed-parentage Native Americans—those with dark skin—to the fringes of legitimate tribal recognition.

Among scholars, this emerging Native American monolith is referred to as “Pan-Indianism.” Pan-Indianism is little more than a dominant group, Euro-American concept validated by the academic prestige of anthropology. Beyond its influence, Pan-Indianism is likely to be irrelevant, as is typical of much of anthropological theory regarding Native groups. In America, anthropologists would suggest that urbanized Native Americans negate their tribal heritage and merge with others to become a Native American monolith [14]. Many scholars, such as Philip J. Deloria, have attempted an analysis of the situation, which not only demonstrates that a diversity of Native Americans can be merged but also suggests by the existence of closed racial, ethnic, and cultural mechanisms how the darker-skinned can be excluded.

Conversely, African-mixed-parentage Native Americans are well aware of their Native American roots and are not ashamed to reference them [15].

Speaking primarily to the folks who have always denied the many truths of U.S. history that tell of imperialist expansion, cultural genocide, and discrimination, Katz makes it seem that it is important to convince his audience that black Indians even existed [15].

Bell hooks [2] criticizes William Loren Katz, author of *Black Indians: A Hidden Heritage*, for not acknowledging Euro-American domination that has made the African-mixed-parentage Native American “invisible.” Furthermore, the invisibility of African-mixed, Native Americans has been facilitated by the social discourse of full-blooded Native Americans and their Euro-mixed-parentage counterparts, particularly in urban locations. Arguably, that discourse contributes to the discrimination against dark-skinned Native Americans of whatever parentage by light-skinned Native Americans: full-blooded or otherwise.

In my own work, I [16] refer to the “one-drop” theory of racial identification, which is an outgrowth of the antebellum era wherein the smallest physical measure of African descent is enough to define one as “black.” This notion was invented by antebellum Euro-Americans to assist in their control of slaves. Years later, Native Americans are not immune to their influence in the context of urbanization and/or assimilation. Thus, full-blooded Native Americans and those of mixed Euro-American parentage by virtue of being light-skinned have allowed for the alienation of dark-skinned Native Americans on the basis of the one-drop theory [17]. In fact, according to V. Dominguez, it may be that a substantial number of African-Americans have at least 25% Euro-American ancestry and perhaps 80% Native American ancestry. Were those same African-Americans citizens of some

South American countries, they would undoubtedly be considered mestizo, or mixed blood.

For various reasons irrespective of urbanization and blood quantum, scholars contend that the Native American population appears to be experiencing significant growth [18]. Unfortunately, their research has ignored the implications of Euro-American domination and its effect upon the Native American perception of dark skin. Surely, some such as Joanne Nagel have acknowledged it in their research but said acknowledgment has been all too subtle [19]. Perhaps there is a feeling that the implications of discrimination on the basis of skin color would invite group disjuncture at a time when unity is imperative [20]. However, scholars in their hesitation may in fact contribute to group disjuncture. In Avery F. Gordon's *Haunting and the Sociological Imagination*, discrimination can be banished from the research literature but not from the reality of the people [21]. Such banishment contributes to tension in the absence of dialog, making it even more controversial and less likely the subject of healthy intellectual debate. Those who prefer to define Native American identity on the basis of skin color and other phenotypes exacerbate disjuncture. Conversely, "in opting for a purely cultural identity rather than a biological one, . . . leaders realize that their legitimacy may be questioned by other Natives, tribes and governments" [22]. Thus, as with this contradiction, the perceived Native American population growth is arguably an extension of personal beliefs.

No doubt, resurgence of the Native American population of late has not been irrelevant to governmental incentives [19]. Furthermore, the increase in governmental programs for Native Americans has provided opportunities for some that might not have been available [18]. This is not to suggest that African-mixed-parentage Native Americans are motivated purely by material gains. They encounter a unique set of circumstances on the basis of skin color. For example, their claiming Native American identity may be problematic for reasons including the following: (a) African-mixed-parentage Native Americans may be seen as wanting to escape the social stigma associated with being black and (b) discrimination on the basis of their skin color may disqualify them because in appearance, unlike their Euro-mixed-parentage counterpart, they are more physically similar to African-Americans, for example, Lumbee, Pequot, and Seminole.

Thus, under the circumstances, it is plausible to suggest that Native Americans—especially the urbanized—have been encouraged to discriminate against their numbers by African blood quantum. In the outcome, dark-skinned Native Americans, regardless of their parentage, have been denied legitimate acceptance into the fold of group nationhood. That denial is Eurocentric in essence because the Native American psyche, like others among victim-group populations, has been shaped, transformed, and constructed in such a way as to create a hierarchy that privileges the dominant light-skinned group and denigrates all others. Limited research overwhelmingly supports the notion that light-skinned Native Americans experience much less difficulty than the darker-skinned and may, in fact, discriminate against them. The modern-day acceptance of light-skinned Native Americans into the fold of mainstream America has resulted in their inculcation of white ways, white culture, and, on occasion, white discrimination.

The issue of discrimination pertaining to Native Americans lives on in African-American and Native American interactions. Arguably, it is the influence of dominant Euro-American groups that has encouraged the phenomena in both the antebellum past and the postbellum present. This is not limited to the Cherokee tribe or any historical era. The continued submission of Native Americans to Euro-American ideals regarding dark-skinned populations is apparent in racial slurs aimed at Afro-Canadians, that is, dark-skinned populations in Canada. Perhaps one of the most noted, due in part to media attention, is the case of professional hockey player Chris Simon. Simon—a member of the Ojibwa tribe—was fined \$36,585 and suspended three games for directing racist remarks at a “black” player named Mike Grier [23]. Inarguably the most white and homogeneous of major sports, the behavior of modern-day Native Americans is analogous to that of their Cherokee forebears. What is more, Native Americans have criticized African-Americans for playing on sports teams that degrade them by symbolic team names and mascot representation, such as the NFL’s Washington Red Skins and the major league baseball team the Cleveland Indians. Yet no African-American has ever hurled public racial slurs or degraded Native Americans in their use of mascots for professional sports teams—their ownership is all but nonexistent. Criticism by Native Americans of Euro-American sports team ownership is all too tacit. This oversight on the part of Native Americans is arguably a manifestation of Euro-American domination and/or mainstream influences [23].

Individual and group analyses of discrimination must consider the overriding impact of the Euro-American social and cultural environment. This will enable the evolution of more conducive coping strategies that will account for the Native American psyche. Particular attention must be given to assisting dark-skinned, mixed-blood Native Americans to develop a broader range of ego protection mechanisms. Dark-skinned, mixed-blood Native Americans must acquire the knowledge to construct a psychological safety zone to accommodate the stigma associated with their skin color, as they challenge the institutionalized domination of Euro-Americans. Additionally, Native American family and community projection processes regarding skin color must necessarily be explored, as dark-skinned Native Americans may need to mend emotional disconnects that weaken their indigenous group systems of support. If this proves a viable strategy, those who are affected must have had a chance to explore some of the color issues in both public and private venues.

An imperative conclusion commencing the postcolonial Native American community is that, despite a multitude of sociohistorical obstacles, many dark-skinned members of the group continue to thrive in a less than idyllic social environment, providing support to their children, families, and communities. Yet, despite the stabilizing, powerful, and constructive influences had by dark-skinned Native Americans upon the various systems, routine micro and macro efforts largely deny or ignore the existence of the Euro-American light skin ideal. There can be little doubt that current scholarship is unwittingly fueled by public perception that distorts a subtle but complex dynamic in the postcolonial setting of Native American people. Native American scholars must acknowledge the taboo nature of the skin color issue

to accommodate its resolution. Seldom recognized is the impact of skin color upon an emotional system that exerts a powerful but not always apparent force upon the collective or dyadic relationship constructs germane to the Native American social system.

Light skin as a manifestation of Euro-American discrimination was less powerful in the Native American community prior to the arrival of settlers from Europe. This notion accommodates the potential for racial harmony. The multicolored Native American population contrasts with the distinct racial groups, characteristic of Euro-Americans in the United States and elsewhere in the West. Despite this fact, Native American norms in the shadow of Euro-American domination harbor concepts of beauty and power that are more Euro-American and less Native American, in substance accommodating a tendency to victim-group discrimination as victimism.

The incident of victimism vis-à-vis skin color is compulsory to the perpetuation of discrimination by Native Americans and other victim-group people of color [24]. It substantiates their simultaneous status as victims and perpetrators. As with the black/white dichotomy, the former is contingent upon having dark skin. The latter is a psychological residue of Euro-American domination [25]. Thus, it logically followed that trends in racial diversity today, augmented by increased levels of miscegenation, accommodate a view that America is no longer or perhaps never was a homogeneous society. In the aftermath, the black/white dichotomy is rendered less relevant. This does not negate the pervasiveness of Euro-American discrimination, but allows for an amplified analysis to include the role engaged by all—including victim-group populations as well. The ultimate outcome in discourse related to the issue will benefit the society at large by contributing to the knowledge base required for its eventual elimination.

While it is well known that responsibility for the genesis of discrimination in America is derived, at least in part, from Europe and its Euro-American counterpart, the role assumed by Native Americans must be acknowledged. If not, the aftermath will enable tolerance of a dual standard of social investigation that will denigrate the struggles of all—regardless of race and/or color—who made the ultimate sacrifice for bringing discrimination to an end.

References

1. Halliburton, R. (1977). *Red over black: black slavery among the Cherokee Indians*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
2. Katz, W. (1986). *Black Indians: a hidden heritage*. New York: Atheneum.
3. Ellison, R. (1972). *Invisible man*. New York: Vintage Press.
4. Woodson, C. (1920). IPOAA Magazine online. http://www.ipaaa.com/africans_indians_only_america.htm. Accessed 26 June 2009.
5. Katz, W. L. *Black Indians*. <http://www.nativeamerican.co.uk/katz.html>. Accessed 26 June 2009.
6. Perdue, T. (1979). *Slavery and the evolution of Cherokee society, 1540–1866*. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press.
7. Boulanger, M. (1974). Black workers and strikes in South Africa. *Race*, 15(3), 351–359.
8. Feagin, J. (2000). *Racist America: roots, current realities and future reparations*. New York: Routledge.

9. Hudson, J. (1995). Simple justice: affirmative action and American racism in historical perspective. *Black Scholar*, 25(3), 16–23.
10. Germain, C. (1991). *Human behavior in the social environment: an ecological view*. New York: Columbia University Press.
11. Hernton, C. (1965). *Sex and racism in America*. New York: Grove.
12. Stember, C. (1976). *Sexual racism*. New York: Elsevier Scientific.
13. Aro, J. (1995). The authority of reason and passion for science: the rules of sociological method. *Sociologia*, 32(2), 81–89.
14. Deloria, P. (1999). *Playing Indian*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
15. hooks, b. (1992). Revolutionary renegades: native Americans, African Americans, and black Indians. In *Black looks: race and representation*. Boston: South End Press.
16. Russell, K., Wilson, M., & Hall, R. E. (1992). *The color complex: the “last taboo” among African Americans*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
17. Dominguez, V. (1997). *White by definition: social classification in Creole Louisiana*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
18. Snipp, M. (1989). *American Indians: the first of this land*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
19. Nagel, J. (1997). *American Indian ethnic renewal: red power and the resurgence of identity and power*. New York: Oxford University Press.
20. Jarvenpa, R. (1985). The political economy and political ethnicity of Indian adoption and identities. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 8, 29–48.
21. Gordon, A. (1997). *Ghostly matters: haunting and the sociological imagination*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
22. Standing Bear, Z. (1994). To guard against invading Indians: struggling for Native community in the southeast. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 18(4), 301–320.
23. Fay, D. (1997). Simon suspended by league. *Washington Times*, November 10.
24. Hall, R. E. (1992, October). Bias among African Americans regarding skin color: implications for social work practice. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 2(4), 479–486.
25. Schiele, J. (1994). Afrocentricity as an alternative world view for equality. *Journal of Progressive Human Services*, 5(1), 5–25.

Chapter 8

Biracial Americans: The Advantages of White Blood

Similar to that of Native Americans, the genesis of victim-group discrimination for biracial Americans is rooted in traditions of slavery and the antebellum South. Biracial Americans during the antebellum period more often than not were the sons and daughters of the slave master class and having light skin on occasion may also have been of Native American ancestry. Whether biracial Americans were mixed blood by having white or Native ancestry their phenotype, light skin set them apart from the darker-skinned African-American populations whose bloodline had not yet been mixed.

Life for biracial Americans during the antebellum was both privileged in some respects and oppressive, in other ways similar to unadulterated dark-skinned blacks. Due to the one-drop theory of racial identity, whites made no distinctions between blacks and biracial Americans, despite the fact that, by genetic proportion, some biracial Americans were more white than black. In the interest of maintaining slavery and the myth of white supremacy, any known African ancestry defined even those who were characterized by blond hair and blue eyes as black. Defined as black, they were subject to discrimination, could be enslaved, relegated to second-class citizenship, and have no more legal access to the institutions of government than any other black person. Some resented being defined solely as black and in numerous ways discriminated against blacks, which included separating themselves from the black community, often friends and family members. During the antebellum, biracial Americans temporarily passed for white when seeking employment and permanently passed when considering marriage to a white fiancé. Permanent passing was a critical form of victim-group discrimination that required that they never again acquaint themselves directly or indirectly with those to whom they were related by blood. Biracial Americans who could not withstand the emotional turmoil associated with their conflicting physical characteristics were designated as “mulatto.” Mulatto was the antebellum term applied to mixed-race or biracial African-Americans who, but for a trace of black blood, were otherwise considered white. Their tragedy was inspired by the contradiction in who they wanted to be—white—and who society required they be—black. Subsequently, they occupied a mid-level racial status, which constantly challenged their quest for identity and group acceptance. However, despite their being defined as black, being of light skin and often having white features accorded many biracial Americans who were

originally described as mulatto a somewhat privileged way of life within the context of the black second-class citizenship. The aftermath accounted for the victimism aimed primarily at their darker-skinned, less-refined, and unadulterated black counterparts.

“Biracial” is a modern term devised and utilized by African-Americans of mixed-race heritage, which eventually came to include all Americans of dual racial background and is not limited to white. They are today an active political voice who have advocated for a separate census category, among other issues. The desire for a separate census category is not irrelevant to a history of indifference regarding white stereotypical beliefs. Some antebellum beliefs held by whites about blacks and mulattoes in general were complimentary, but no less discriminatory. For example, blacks and mulattoes were said by Southern whites to be more talented in the areas of music, arts, dancing, and acting. They were assumed to have innate abilities in the handling of animals and children. Despite common assertions to the contrary, they were also assumed to be loyal and reliable servants, which of course facilitated a discriminatory belief that all nonwhites were more suited for work in service to whites. The fact that whites believed that blacks and mulattoes were happy, warm, and emotionally balanced, regardless of their depiction as heathens, did not warrant curiosity to any significant extent. All white beliefs concerning blacks and mulattoes could be reduced to a single common denominator: They fell short of challenging any notions of white oppression because such oppression was accepted as the norm in a world where discrimination dominated.

Scholars interested in the study of white beliefs about blacks and mulattoes could produce volumes of research on the topic. However, careful analysis necessitate they perform the daunting task of distilling fact from the maze of folklore and mistruths to arrive at the underlying motive statements such as:

For both the student of popular beliefs on the Negro and the detective, the guide to the explanation is given in the question: To whose good? Beliefs are opportune; they are in the service of interests. It's these general and specific rationalization needs which give the beliefs their pertinacity. They give to the stereotypes their emotional load and their value to the people who hold to them [1].

In this, the aforementioned beliefs about blacks, which included mulattoes, are contained genesis of victim-group discrimination as in the mulatto hypothesis [1]. The mulatto hypothesis was a loosely organized pseudoscientific theory that convinced mixed-blood mulatto blacks that they were in a status and societal worth above their unadulterated counterparts by virtue of white ancestry. Mulattoes were considered inferior to the white man but superior to blacks in intelligence, morals, and civil refinement. The ultimate aim was to exhaust every available means to sustain the myth of white supremacy. As they had so often done in the past to reinforce the myth, white scholars including Oliver Goldsmith infused religion in their beliefs, suggesting that no less than Adam of the Garden of Eden was indeed white.

Goldsmith was not alone in his attempts to sustain white supremacy. The numbers of nonscientists willing to comment on the subject were unlimited. Scottish philosopher David Hume made perhaps an even more dramatic statement regarding

race than did Goldsmith. He was convinced that races that lived nearer the poles were much different from those who lived nearer the tropics. Both were inferior to whites who lived in more temperate zones. Such a notion was not new. It was also the belief of ancient Greeks, who ironically had been civilized on the island of Crete by Africans [2]. The result of Hume's assertion was not only to sustain white supremacy but also, by association, to suggest the superiority of mulattoes in their white-like light skin. That association served whites or any mulatto black person who looked white. But Goldsmith, in *History of the Earth*, is the more dramatic in validating the mulatto hypothesis. He determines which groups are superior and then expounds upon the virtues associated with those having light skin. In reference to white people in Europe, Goldsmith states:

The inhabitants of these countries differ a good deal from each other; but they generally agree in the colour of their bodies, the beauty of their complexions, the largeness of their limbs, and the vigour of their understandings. Those arts which might have had their invention among the other races of mankind, have come to perfection there [3].

In 1918, Reuter conducted a thorough study of the mulatto in the United States. Based upon accepted beliefs of the time about skin color, science, religion, and motivation combined to promote some universal form of the mulatto hypothesis. Succinctly put, light-skinned mulattoes, being closer to white, not only occupied a mid-level racial status above that of their darker-skinned brethren but were endowed, being closer to whites, with the right to distance themselves just as whites might from both blacks and mulattoes. This right to distance themselves from blacks necessarily included discrimination by mulatto blacks who did not want to be associated with such a despised inferior population. For those who did so, whites acknowledged their superiority to blacks in various ways including wealth, education, and overall quality of life. The sole means of determining who mulattoes were was based purely upon the observation of skin color. Thus, in the event a mulatto black was born whose features did not conform to the traditional light skin, she or he would have no basis upon which to claim special status. Likewise, any black person born of dual black parentage, but who, by some unusual biological circumstances, displayed mulatto light skin would be treated accordingly.

In the aftermath of white supremacy, light skin was affectively idealized in validating the mulatto hypothesis. Those who would become biracial Americans as blacks enjoyed social, occupational, economic, and universal advantages because the mulatto hypothesis defined them as an exception among the inferior. The need to define blacks as inferior was associated with white supremacy and motivation for victim-group discrimination by mulattoes. They became the favored class among blacks, often selected for the less rigorous work as they were considered able thinkers and generally closer to whites in every social, cultural, and political way. Hence, among trained mechanics and the most trusted house servants in the antebellum South—which dark-skinned blacks referred to as “house Negroes”—the vast majority were light-skinned mulatto blacks. What is more, whites preferred mulattoes to pure blacks by their “better appearance.” Whites were less offended by

mulatto light skin and felt more inclined to select mulattoes for work, which brought them into closest contact with whites.

The mulatto hypothesis encouraged victim-group discrimination by mulattoes against unadulterated darker-skinned blacks. The mulatto hypothesis was a convenient boundary between blacks and mulattoes during the antebellum, in that free status was prevalent among mulattoes. Many had been given their freedom by white males who, though they had owned them, were actually their fathers. In fact, the mulatto among free blacks was so prevalent that in some cases was synonymous with manumission. Manumission-in-common enabled mulattoes to acquire an education long before darker-skinned blacks could because, through the mulatto hypothesis, they were already considered more intelligent and worthy. This further accommodated in-group separation between blacks and suggested that the mulatto's assumed superiority was real. In fact, prior to the Civil War, any black person described as educated was sure to be mulatto. Such advantages reinforced white beliefs in mulatto superiority, as many actually were able to distinguish themselves via special opportunities not provided to darker-skinned blacks.

Darker-skinned blacks were not irrelevant to the spread of the mulatto hypothesis as many, with some exception, secretly admired mixed-race blacks for their refined character and social exclusiveness. In an effort to buffer themselves from the stigma associated with their black blood, these same mulattoes did not hesitate to exaggerate their assumed superiority. They expressed little sympathy for their darker-skinned brothers, who might envy them being forced to labor under harsh conditions in the cotton fields. Free antebellum mulattoes formed private societies, which denied membership to pureblood blacks and plantation slaves. Particularly in the North, the status of having been a slave was an additional trait mulattoes used to look down on less fortunate blacks. Thus, by virtue of the mulatto hypothesis, the free mulatto society of Charleston, South Carolina, developed into a rather sophisticated and highly selective organization. In other Southern communities such as New Orleans, Louisiana, and Mobile, Alabama, mulatto blacks maintained a glaring separation from other blacks. In fact, mulattoes there were so distinct and separate from other blacks that some had volunteered to fight on the Confederate side in the Civil War; that was the exception rather than the rule. But skin color and bloodline assured continual separation between the mulatto, free blacks, dark-skinned blacks, and slaves.

Northern whites frequently felt themselves above the racial fray of Southern plantation owners. However, whites in the North maintained a color caste system no less oppressive than the Southern version that had contributed to sustaining the mulatto hypothesis. It also contributed to disjuncture in the black community in the association of light skin with superiority. Consequently, Northern mulatto blacks were no less black than they were in the South and they, too, formed exclusive societies and remained aloof from darker-skinned blacks. Like some among Southern mulattoes, a few Northern mulattoes applied their assumed superiority to advocate by leadership for their less able brethren. Their assumed superiority and formal education positioned them to play a leadership role in confronting white oppression. Some among darker-skinned, pureblood blacks took issue with the mulattoes'

assumed superiority and their unchallenged leadership role to speak for unadulterated darker-skinned blacks. Such blacks maintained that mulatto blacks neither lived among them nor associated with them and thus could not convey their pain and suffering. Despite such resentment, many of the same dark-skinned blacks aspired to gain admission to the exclusive mulatto leadership societies and escape their associations with the pure unadulterated blacks. They recognized that mulattoes were in some ways outside the race or, as they believed, above the race. Due to their light skin, the mulatto hypothesis suggested mixed-race blacks were but a shade of color from being equal to whites in every way. If they continued to excel and advocate by leadership for their darker-skinned brethren, mulattoes were optimistic about eventual equality. But, for the moment, they would advocate for the inferior and despised.

Contrary to mulatto black leadership, the more hostile among mulattoes were contemptuous of lower-class blacks whose manner and lifestyles they contend conformed to white stereotypes. This further motivated them to excel in whatever ventures in hopes of differentiating themselves from lower-class, dark-skinned blacks. Listed in *Who's Who in Colored America*, compiled by Byron Reuter in 1918, these successful blacks, with few exceptions, were identified as light-skinned and mulatto [4]. On occasion, a dark-skinned black might make such a list, but because of some exceptional feat would be designated as mulatto.

Arguably, Northern mulattoes were more convinced of the mulatto hypothesis than their Southern counterparts. Regardless of their leadership role and superior education, they were without a definitive function in the black community, perhaps due to the less overt racism in the North. But, per the mulatto hypothesis, they were proud of their white blood, their white features, their "good" hair as well as their wealth. Some might even make public comment about the fact. They not only chose to separate from the black community but, as with mulatto blacks in other areas of the country, were exclusive in their associations. They attended mulatto churches for light-skinned blacks only or white churches where they might pass. Those who were bona fide members of the upper class then had few associations. They almost never came in contact with darker-skinned blacks in their social or professional lives. Their attitude toward dark-skinned blacks was the same as that of whites: They thought them ignorant, filthy, immoral, and perhaps less than human. They forced themselves to tolerate dark-skinned blacks at best and expressed contempt from which emerged outright discrimination and hatred whenever such blacks presumed to consider themselves an equal. Thus, in public, mulatto black leadership may have facilitated black unity in their rhetoric, but viewing themselves as superior harbored not the least illusion to have any intimate associations [4].

The complexity of mixed-race mulatto blacks resulted in numerous attempts to resolve any disputes as to their backgrounds within the courts. While problems permeated the courts involving racial issues, other institutions such as the US Census Department experienced even greater difficulty. A less quantifiable but practical solution was utilized by local communities in the application of personal knowledge to assess a black's status as a free house Negro or bonded field Negro, which of course amounted to little more than personal preference or biased even racist

opinion. Thus, the manner in which whites racially assessed blacks determined not only their racial heritage but whether or not they were free to take part in the privileges and opportunities allowed ordinary American citizens. Based on race, no system of categorization could have been less objective or scientific. Accordingly, in 1862, when the District of Columbia decided to abolish slavery, the owners of slaves were required to complete documentation of house Negroes and field Negroes as their prior property through skin color description. This description included designation by color, as in the following: "dark black, quite black, light black, dark brown, light brown, chestnut, dark chestnut, copper-colored, dark copper, light copper, yellow, dark yellow, bright yellow, pale yellow, very light, and nearly white" [5]. Such official category terms were surely an embarrassment to all but the most blatant of Southern master class racists.

Not only was racial heritage critical in the determination of freedom for light-skinned, mulatto house Negroes but it was crucial for their inheritance of wealth and property as well. According to Martha Hodes, two 1850 Georgia court cases made apparent the manner in which race category could be challenged legally and in the community [5]. Both cases involved the male offspring of a white mother, and both cases offered conflicting testimony from members of the local community as to whether or not the fathers of the sons had been field Negro men of dark-skinned African descent. Despite harsh taboos against such interracial sex between black men and white women, the community, however tacitly, tolerated its existence, which the courts could not acknowledge officially in public documents. In resolving the case, it became clear that much of the conflicting testimony from members of the white community was contingent upon some people having to acknowledge interracial sex and others having to deny it, for traditional reasons. The involvement of wealth in such cases necessitated resolution of race criteria where it might otherwise have been considered less significant. This issue of wealth was one of the most potent factors that inspired mulatto, black house Negroes to distance themselves politically from the masses of the impoverished, field Negro, black underclass. To do otherwise might jeopardize the relative privileged life styles most house Negro mulattoes had come to know. They thus felt rescued by their mixed-race blood, as many were the offspring not of some poor ignorant Irish overseer but in fact of upper-class white icons.

From the perspective of most historians, the number of the mulatto black aristocratic class was quite small. However, in comparison to darker-skinned field Negroes, the black aristocratic elite who were descended from house Negroes lived relatively lavish lifestyles. Similar to whites, they distinguished themselves as old family elite, and as the newcomers. At various times and places, this wealthy class of black people were known as the "colored aristocracy," the "black 400," the "upper tens," and "best society" as opposed to their dark-skinned, inferior ethnic group other [6].

What is most salient about the aristocratic elite as a class is how it regarded itself in comparison to both the black and white communities, between which it is considered to have existed. The black aristocratic elite regarded themselves as privileged based upon its values, norms, traditions, education, and other characteristics

reflective of the white community. They were sure to reference the fact that the black community was not a monolith and that, while the masses of illiterate, lower-class, dark-skinned field Negroes were justly regarded as inferior, the aristocratic mulatto black elite among them were as civilized and poised as any white person. Particularly, poor whites were offended by this attitude, referring to them as “uppity blacks” and the field Negro black masses were no less given to such intense anger. They recognized that the effort on the part of the mulatto black elite to improve their lot was done at the expense of denigrating and discriminating against less fortunate darker-skinned blacks. In the aftermath of dislike for one another, such blacks often exceeded dislike on the part of whites for black folk in general.

Aristocratic mulatto, black elite communities were evident in the shadows of Southern plantations where just a few short years before many had lived and worked. While most whites in the South and elsewhere regarded the whole of black folk as inferior, some did acknowledge existing class distinctions. In 1877, a Southerner employed as a writer for *Atlantic* magazine made note of an elite class among black South Carolinians who practiced a rigid form of social ranking and discrimination [6]. In daily life, they used painstaking measures to see to it that no lowly, dark-skinned field Negro could enter their ranks by marriage, social circumstances, or community affairs. If any black outsiders managed to acquire unusual wealth or prestige, they might have been privileged to enter the ranks of the mulatto black elite, but even then within such ranks they would be less than equal to established members.

Whatever the circumstances, it is well known that a discriminating, aristocratic, mulatto black elite existed throughout the American South in both small towns and large cities. A widely read white journalist reported that in the South there were two factions of aristocratic black elite evolving, which consisted of an aristocracy of culture and an aristocracy of wealth. However, regardless to which faction the black elite might aspire, their status within the community was grounded in their official station in life, their church position, amount of wealth including money or real estate, their previous ownership, and the city where they were born. Additionally, when such criteria were satisfactory, the issue of skin color was not irrelevant to overall importance [6].

In the late twentieth century, a white teacher who was employed in the Negro school district in Memphis, Tennessee, took note of the elaborate class distinctions blacks made, by listening to and observing her black students. She concluded that they far exceeded whites in their zeal to distinguish differentiations within the group. They created a greater number of categories and defended respect for those categories with more enthusiasm than whites. At the very height of the black community was the “Negro aristocracy,” more often than not previously light-skinned house Negroes. Even in the smallest of Southern towns, at least one such family could be found among the residents. Membership required a black person born into such a class assuming money, education, and a style of conduct that was fitting of the group. The class sustained itself by a common form of victim-group discrimination in marriage, selective of only those who possessed similar qualities. When exceptions were made, education or some extraordinary accomplishment

might suffice, but wealth alone would never prove satisfactory. Those lighter in skin color experienced greater leniency in making exceptions compared to those who were darker-skinned or otherwise held striking resemblance to lowly, despised, dark-skinned field Negroes.

Given that the mulatto black aristocratic elite were descendants of light-skinned antebellum house Negroes, they were much less of a threat socially and politically to the white community. They were not envisioned to take part in the Nat Turner rebellion, though some were of like mind. However, for the most part being viewed by whites as less of a threat resulted in their becoming the first among blacks en masse to be educated, gain professional employment, and thus become the first leaders of the black community. They resided in the best houses located in the black community, traveled for Northern vacations, and provided books, musical instruments, and the best education that money could buy for their children. Their fear of reverting back to a slave status resulted in placing great emphasis upon acquiring an education. The most desirable educations were those that prepared their children to assume a professional occupation such as doctor, lawyer, or minister. Those who became doctors would be immune to failure and secure their status as members of the mulatto black aristocratic elite. This might be cause to have only the most discriminating contact with the dark-skinned underclass, but there was some sense of responsibility, however limited, that elite blacks felt toward the underclass black masses. They perceived themselves as setting an example for lower-class blacks to aspire. Such blacks should look to them for morals, ideals, cultural poise, and general self-improvement. However well intended mulatto black aristocrats might have been, their efforts were not appreciated by the Negro underclass. Many considered them to be too arrogant and so far removed from the black community that any kind of alliance between the two was virtually impossible. This inspired many blacks, who felt unappreciated, to express even more disdain for lower-class blacks than done by their white counterparts. Frustrated, the mulatto black elite were satisfied with doing whatever necessary to maintain order and provide for the continued successes of their own.

While much blame was laid upon lower-class blacks for the ills of society, whites and mulatto blacks both looked then to the lower classes as an imposition upon the society at large. In 1893, in Knoxville, Tennessee, a member of the mulatto black aristocratic elite suggested that the potential of his class suffered as a consequence of the lack of morals and culture displayed by the masses of the underclass dark-skinned field Negroes. In order to remedy the problem, he suggested an even greater differentiation within the black community and an ever more rigid observance of such differentiations than had been practiced in the past. Accordingly, this would make it easier to separate the immoral and dysfunctional elements where they could no longer impose upon the race as a whole [6].

The efforts of the mulatto black elite in the South were not peculiar to the lifestyles of similarly situated whites. They, too, held disdain for the lowest elements of the white community who, regardless of how poor or uneducated they were, considered themselves higher in status than that of the most esteemed among mulatto black elites. Whites both rich and poor made no distinctions among black

folk, although they were well aware of the fact that class differences did exist. The mulatto black elite might acquire enough wealth to reside in the house or location of their choice. However, the traditions of discrimination and segregation required they locate in the best areas of the black community. On occasion, poor whites might seek residence in the black area of town, but that was by choice and, even then, it was an option of last resort. The mixing of the races was still a social taboo, while growth in the mixed-race population was significant. At least publicly, within the white community, strict separation of the races enabled the public appearance of race separation. However, life and social traditions especially in the urban North were somewhat different. Slavery was not the custom there, and the predominance of urban life served as a vehicle for interaction between the races, which was less possible in a small-town Southern environment where the social details of residents were common knowledge throughout. Despite the fact that Northern urban areas offered more opportunities for racial integration, the situation between the mulatto black elite descendants of light-skinned house Negroes and the dark-skinned field Negroes was no less separate and distinct: In the South, the descendants of house Negroes were more often referred to as aristocrats; in the North, they were more often designated as the "upper tens."

Like their Southern counterparts, the Northern mulatto black, aristocratic elite, in such cities as New York and Philadelphia, emphasized family background, education, tradition, and respectability within the community. They included lawyers, doctors, salaried employees, business owners, and entertainers. As was customary, they sought to distance themselves from the masses of field Negro blacks whenever possible. The most assertive about class were proud to be members of the older established black families. Being the member of an older black elite family meant that one's relatives had arrived prior to the Civil War. Among Boston's older upper tens were black families such as the Duprees, Haydens, Walkers, Baldwins, Allstons, Lattimores, and Ruffins [6]. The most outstanding of this group, according to Willard B. Gatewood [6], were those descended from Brazillia Lew. According to reliable sources, Brazillia Lew was a black Bostonian said to have taken part in the American Revolution. Indicative of the upper tens, the Lew family was not particularly wealthy, but their history as participants in the Revolutionary War entitled them to acquire membership in Boston's black upper tens. As recently as 1952, eight generations of the Lew family were credited with significant roles in the social and civic life of the Boston black community [6].

The upper tens, while quite discreet in membership, were not averse to fraternizing with black Southerners. Those among the favored included distinguished families such as the Grimkes, Trotters, Riddleys, and Chappelles [6]. They were known to be socially exclusive from darker-skinned blacks, but did seek and encourage associations with whites. These Northern upper ten descendants of house Negroes, with few exceptions, were always mulattoes. They took offense to being referred to as Negro. One such member of the upper tens reported to a white investigator who was interested in writing about the black community:

When you write of the Negroes of Boston tell about us who are neither Negroes nor whites, but an ambiguous something-between a people not yet known or named. While our sympathies tend to unite us with the Negroes and their destiny, all our aspirations lead us toward white [6].

Stephan Talty suggests that early in the antebellum whites were mostly indifferent as to the welfare of blacks; they were considered as much a part of the Southern landscape as magnolia trees and chicken coops. But mulattoes were conspicuous, being lighter-skinned. Their white-like skin color might cause confusion at a slave auction. Perhaps their light skin made it difficult to perceive mulattoes as being black. For example, in 1821, a Louisville auction of a mulatto woman and her children occurred. They were described “as white as any of our citizens.” The local community was so stunned that no one offered a bid for them while dark-skinned blacks at the same auction were sold immediately. Apparently, whites were so disgusted with any associations of light skin with bondage that bidding on white-looking mulattoes was all but impossible. On the other hand, light-skinned mulattoes who were black enough that their blood mixture was apparent were prized at auctions. Black women, in particular, were sought for sexual exploitation by white males. But mulattoes who were so light-skinned as to appear white were too strong a suggestion, as if sexual exploitation would be raping a white woman. In fact, it was reported that a small number of whites had been kidnapped by other whites and then sold into slavery. This took place prior to the Civil War and weighed heavily upon the white conscience. There were no official accounts of such slavery as most were merely rumors or hearsay, which probably increased the impact. But the fact is that white children, white immigrants, and white orphans were easily shipped to the South and sold into bondage through unscrupulous auctioneers. Their stories, as grist of the rumor mill, were told in the memoirs and courtrooms of antebellum slave territories [7].

Many mixed-race mulatto blacks joined forces with other persons designated as “colored” and agitated for equal access and equal rights comparable to those of whites. Unspoken was their belief that, while they were not white, they were superior to pureblood blacks. Accepting the black race label assigned to them, mixed-blood persons often took leading roles in African-American political organizations. Others attempted, sometimes successfully, to maintain their in-between positions. Forming closed societies—tight-knit communities in which all the members shared the same ancestry, physical characteristics, and culture—they often rejected altogether racial designations that ignored their mixed-race status, preferring to emphasize their differentiations from darker-skinned blacks. Still, most mulatto blacks lived and worked in a world dominated and delineated by whites. Despite their snobbish attitudes and separatist efforts, they interacted with whites in the public world. Many recognized that, while the law made them black, their appearances often told another story. Seeing that segregation was essentially a dividing of persons by skin color, many of those blacks characterized by light skin blended into the white world. In black folklore, this phenomenon is often called by various colloquialisms, including “the other side,” “crossing,” or just “passing” [8].

Perhaps the ultimate act of discrimination against dark-skinned blacks by mixed-race mulatto blacks was physical separation from the black community. In doing so, the colloquialism of passing is not coincidental; it was used to describe mixed-race mulatto blacks who despised blacks to attempt escape from their blackness, and everything and everyone associated with it. Their contempt for dark-skinned blacks motivated aspirations to reap the benefits of being perceived as white, which often led to a kind of social death by being estranged from the black community. According to *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary*, passing is defined as "the act of identifying oneself as white used of a person having black ancestry or otherwise black in racial origin" [9]. Passing has been utilized in some form by a number of ethnic groups in the United States who do not fit the white Anglo-Saxon ideal. Jews, for example, have altered their noses while Asians have altered other aspects of facial features including the eye fold to appear more Caucasian-like. For the most part, these two groups have a phenotype, at least pertaining to skin color, similar to the light skin American ideal. African-Americans or dark-skinned black people are antithetical to the white ideal in that they have the darkest skin of any group within the human species. Following miscegenation in the aftermath of slavery, a nation of mulatto black mixed-blood peoples emerged from the antebellum circumstances, whose features ranged from the African dark to the Caucasian light. Given racism and Jim Crow attitude that were antebellum traditions, an eventual advantage evolved for those who had acquired enough Caucasian genes to present themselves visually as white [10]. Except for the one-drop theory, many would indeed have been classified as white. But in America, white has been defined by the notion of racial purity. Any infusion of black blood automatically has determined the subject in question to be a member of the denigrated black race who, by law, was forbidden the rights and privileges of ordinary white men. Thus, by introducing black blood into a family's gene pool, they acquired the ethnic status of a stigmatized member of society.

Whether or not a light-skinned, male or female black person decided to pass was left up to the individual. There were, however, any number of reasons upon which the decision could have been based. Given this reality, one fact is certain: For economic, social, and political reasons light skin for mulatto black Americans gave them a decided advantage. To clearly understand that advantage requires study of the phenomenon in an historical context.

From the very dawn of miscegenation in the antebellum South, the definition of "black" bordered on the absurd. Scholars of the day must have been aware of how ridiculous such a definition was, but none objected with any authority. In addition, there was no fail-safe method to visually determine the racial character of any American. Thus, the idea of passing as a game to avoid discrimination by whites and to experience an enhanced quality of life began with the first mixed-race mulatto blacks who perhaps migrated far enough from home or the South to escape knowledge of their black family background.

Depending on the degree to which a person passed—from sitting in the white section of a theater to working in an exclusively white occupation to completely altering one's identity—a black person who was passing necessarily separated not

only from the black community but from his or her family and peers. For instance, blacks passing for white in the public realm often had to ignore darker-skinned black friends and family as they walked by in the market place. It also sometimes meant moving into a neighborhood where one's friends and family would be conspicuous to the white eye. Often, passing entailed altering one's legal status or the status of one's children. For others, passing for white meant leaving the city, state, or region and losing communication with peers and siblings. Considering the maneuverings and risks that racial passing required, it is understandable that many did not think it was worth the trouble. Nevertheless, passing proved a useful tool to many blacks of mixed-race whose appearances were white or marginal enough to be perceived as white.

Black Americans who passed in the postbellum period often did so for reasons that differed from their earlier counterpart. He or she was likely to harbor a more serious pathology with regard to psychological health. In an era where physical safety, at least by antebellum standards, was less a part of reality, there was accordingly less need on the part of mixed-race mulatto blacks to pass. However, as America became more urbanized, with more immigrants of color, passing became not only significantly more possible but more likely as well. Myrdal makes that abundantly clear in his classic *An American Dilemma*:

The immigration of darker-skinned peoples from Eastern Europe and from around the Mediterranean Sea and also from Latin America, especially Mexico, and the rising social respectability of the Native American, made passing for something other than black easier for the Negro [11].

Since these immigrant groups were less likely to settle in the South where the "Negro" was rooted, geographic location became a potent factor in passing. However, the dynamics associated with the light skin of mixed-race mulatto blacks were not all bliss. Their problems became a popular theme utilized in early Hollywood films, that of the so-called tragic mulatto. The tragic mulatto represented light-skinned, mixed-race African-Americans born into a world that defined them as African-American through any trace of African heritage, while visually they appeared to be white. The prevailing desire among mulatto blacks was to escape their despised blackness, which motivated their passing for white and to which white people—including their blood relatives—were opposed. The end result was that for mulatto black Americans the ability to belong was a constant struggle, hence being tragic.

Light-skinned African-American women portrayed the tragic mulatto in film, while men were equally convincing via their portrayal in literature. In Walter White's *A Man Called White*, the oppressions of race were revealed through chance encounter and coincidence [12]. Walter White, head of the NAACP from 1930 to 1955, was waiting for a train in New York City and stepped on the toe of a black man standing behind him. He turned to apologize to find the black man staring at him. The man's face was hard and full of bitterness. The man shouted obscenities and asked White to look where he was going, accusing white people of always stepping on black people. A moment later, White was approached by

another African-American who wanted to discuss White's NAACP work regarding legislation of a permanent Fair Employment Practices Committee. The man whose toe had been stepped on listened then apologized. He had realized that the person he thought was a white man was, in fact, the leader of the NAACP. Walter White was not white. In his book, White insists there is nothing in his mind or heart to tempt him to think that, yet he realizes that the only attribute that matters in America is skin color. As a light-skinned African-American, privilege and arrogance may be seen in his black leadership role, but he concedes there is magic in a white skin; there is tragedy, loneliness, and exile in a black skin. He is confused by the lack of logic in that he insists he is black, when nothing but his self compels him to do so, hence the conflicting tragedy of the tragic mulatto.

Mixed-race, African-American men who preferred dating white women as a form of pseudo-passing may have been emotionally and psychologically bruised by the experience. Willard Motley, in *The Almost White Boy*, describes such a scenario between a mulatto African-American man named Jim and a white girl named Cora [12]. While on the street, Jim encounters a fast type named Slick, a man reputedly called Slick because of his way with women and because he wore all the latest fashions in men's clothes. Slick fit the stereotype and was undeniably black—he was an embarrassment. Knowing Slick made it apparent to Jim's white girlfriend that Jim was black. Once introduced, Slick proceeded on his way. Cora's attitude toward Jim changed following her introduction to Slick. Cora never went to Jim's house again; she had him come by when he wanted to see her. The first time she had him over she prepared him for what might be her family's reaction. She insisted Jim never reveal to her folks that he was black—asking him to pass. According to her, her father did not like black people, as he was not as broad-minded as she. Being a light-skinned, African-American man, Jim was forced to struggle with the issue of denying some aspect of his heritage or lose Cora's companionship—characteristic of the dilemmas faced by the tragic mulatto.

Langston Hughes, in *Who's Passing for White*, describes a black man out with his light-skinned, African-American wife [12]. He is approached by a white man in a restaurant and told to keep his hands off "that white woman." The black man insists the woman is not white and that she is his wife. A waiter in the restaurant confirms his assertion. The white man then looks puzzled, drops his fists, and apologizes. The woman, who had been silent, insisted she was black and admonished the white man to leave her husband alone. Both proceeded to assault the white man who was eventually asked to pay his bill and leave. Probably no harm was intended on the part of the white man, who had given in to the rigid definition of race based on skin color and that was further complicated by the white phenotype of the tragic mulatto.

Social access to a more human condition by mixed-blood mulatto blacks, including so-called quadroons (1/4 black) and octoroons (1/8 black), was by having light skin and—much to their delight—compromised the ability of whites to identify them as black on sight. What is more, in the antebellum African-American community, the conditions under which mixed-blood mulattoes lived their daily lives contributed to giving them a more favorable position than the dark-skinned. Their having been the offspring of wealthy slave owners and persons of consequence in

society allowed for greater access to opportunity. Living in or near the “big house,” they were closer to society of the dominant culture than the dark-skinned field hands. They were the first to get the benefit of education, and they shared, to some extent at least, the prestige of their masters and progenitors [13]. Through such circumstances, many among such blacks enthusiastically passed for white to escape denigration and acquire some measure of dignity. As a group, blacks in a position to pass for white were smart, creative, frequently educated, and the most likeable of men and women. Their ages likely ranged from mid-twenties to mid-forties. The significance of age was a function of mobility. The amount of time a black might pass varied in each situation, but more often than not was limited. Once the period of passing ended, such as in employment, the perpetrators would often share their stories in great detail with other blacks. Blacks who passed might include screenwriters, schoolteachers in the South, Wall Street workers, theological students, and career servicemen [13]. During postbellum eras, these blacks would never have been allowed to practice in such professions because of racial reasons and Jim Crow attitudes. In passing for white, they gained acceptance by promoting themselves as something other than black. Their motives included opportunity, safety, adventure, or some desire to escape the black community. They have passed both by mistake or intention. By intention, they passed to circumvent the tragic mulatto conflict or rejection. Other reasons include passing to pursue professional aspirations. Some passed temporarily and on occasion permanently, and in their own ways each dealt with the moral and ethical implications of the act that so often imposed upon their conscience.

For those mulatto blacks with the most daring, or perhaps the greatest investment in their whiteness, the possibility of altering their legal status remained a desired experience. Black persons of mixed race recognized that, in some cases, a white appearance was enough to garner them the rewards they sought; in other cases, official proof of one’s race was necessary. Government documents or various church papers, including baptism and marriage records, required that they confirm their racial status [14]. By obtaining these records and falsifying them (depending upon the definition of “colored” in a locale), some persons secured their white status by passing and the economic, political, and social gains and opportunities associated with passing [14].

Some among mixed-race mulatto blacks decided to view their light skin color in a pragmatic fashion. Their views facilitated unintended discrimination in the denigration of dark skin. To some this is interpreted as self-hate. Still to others, it is perceived as doing what was necessary to get by. Thus, if all the inferiority stemmed from Negroness, and Negroness stemmed from blackness, and the Negroness lay in Africa, each person could according to his character and skin color seek his own passing cutoff point. He could try to cease being a Negro. He could downgrade his blackness. Most easily of all, he could divorce himself politically, socially, and otherwise from Africa and all things associated with it [15]. Some mulatto blacks, who were white enough, did the former, passing right out of the Negro community permanently. Those who were not white enough or had dark skin but wanted desperately to be white succeeded only in ending up among the pathological case

histories of local psychiatric hospital wards. In its more viable form, this same condition turned up in Negro life as color caste [15]. But there were still many who were too Negro, too healthy, or too intelligent to carry their self-rejection quite so far. They could not or would not deny their identity as African-Americans, nor deny their blackness as ideal, perhaps not even the infamous one-drop theory. But they could with much greater ease and reasonableness be cut off from Africa. Many of them commonly did this by passing temporarily, to enjoy a moment of humanity that had been denied by racist cultural traditions [15].

Behavior determined a passer's success in maintaining the act. Certain speech patterns, gestures, and so forth were commonly associated with being black. As long as the passer avoided any display of such patterns, he might benefit from their light skin color and remain unnoticed among the white population. Thus, a quiet, low-keyed profile was often more than enough to succeed in selling the facade. Most mixed-race mulatto blacks had already acquired the social skills and mannerisms of whites, having been raised among them, so going unnoticed among them was not at all difficult. In many instances, blacks raised among whites lived with or near their white parent, usually a white male. Thus, behaviors attributed to being black were already foreign to them. When they took it upon themselves to engage passing, as a discriminatory act of black rejection, in effect they were more likely doing what came natural.

Passing was a physiological phenomenon in which the only means of detection was family history. For this reason, it was quite difficult for unknowing whites to detect passers. In fact, detection was so well guarded by passers and their black families that marriages to whites have been consummated where the white spouse suspected nothing of Negro ancestry in the bloodline of their mate. While researchers could not know as much about this phenomenon as they would have liked, some factors were readily apparent. The first and most obvious is that mixed-race blood was a necessary attribute to assume the desired light-skinned appearance. The second is the implications of gender. Women were scrutinized to a greater extent than men. Thus, those who could not account for their backgrounds were dismissed immediately.

Although mixed-race phenotypes enabled light-skinned blacks to pass, there were other mixtures with the same potential. Mixed-race Native American blood, for example, in the black population is an established fact. However, unlike white mixtures, Native blood did not enter the black population by rape of black women, but more likely under agreeable union circumstances. What is more, there had been such miscegenation between antebellum blacks and Native Americans that the US government encountered great difficulty in determining who was Native and who was not [13].

Passing was ultimately a phenomenon of the Southern antebellum, racial caste system [14]. If mixed-race mulatto blacks were light-skinned enough, passing was a relatively easy matter. Due to the fact that blacks were assumed initially to have no white blood at all, those who did and who had white features were in effect given access to an identity alternative. The passer would almost always be from black to white, as it would have been impractical to desire a descent in caste status.

Additionally, there would have been no reason other than black racial pride, a fact for some, whereby mixed-race mulatto blacks would have abhorred the act. In addition, it goes without saying that any white passing for black would have been all but unheard of and via skin color virtually impossible.

Blacks who migrated to the North for passing on a permanent basis caused the disjuncture of their families left in the South. Any number of black American families know of someone with light skin who left North Carolina, Virginia, and Maryland, for example, and who moved to New York or Philadelphia, never to be heard from again. This form of passing required that passers never look back on the home and families they left behind. Some might chance to reappear on the occasion of a family funeral, but this was infrequent if ever at all. Without leaving a trace, these souls were lost to the white community forever. Being so resolved to some extent stresses the tragic mulatto, in finding a place to belong. Permanent membership in the white community meant that mulatto blacks struggling to escape the inferiority associated with their black heritage could consider it irrelevant.

Today, being of mixed race no longer carries the stress and shame that it once did during the American antebellum, allowing for passing as an unnecessary option. Mulatto is an antiquated term and, having been replaced by biracial Americans, is no longer a tragic situation. However, through victim-group discrimination any association with black heritage remains a status burden upon those so identified. Modern biracial Americans are free to embrace and be embraced by their white parentage and have often done so with enthusiasm. Despite a minor modification in nomenclature, from mixed-race mulatto black to biracial, the pursuit of a white identity is continually manifested in complete separation from blacks. Subsequently, biracial Americans now advocate for a completely distinct racial category in vehement opposition to being labeled as solely black. Their effort is a modern version of passing to the extent they redefine or otherwise deny their blackness. Others prefer still to pass permanently, as did their mulatto black forbears under less brutal circumstances. By passing and advocating a distinct biracial category, modern mixed-race black, biracial Americans, represent a manifestation of victim-group discrimination.

Biracial Americans whose skin is light enough to let them pass have presented themselves as white because that act and that identity can improve their quality of life. Dr. Alvin Poussaint contends [16] that some light-skinned biracial Americans, such as actresses Jennifer Beals and Renee Tenison, play down their blackness simply because they do not think there is any advantage in being identified as black. With their light skin and straight hair they can pass as Greek or Italian, escape the obvious stigmas associated with being black, and enjoy the privileges of a white person. Often, as with Eurogamy among Asian women, they succeed by selecting romantic unions with white males. Even if they choose not to define themselves, they are clearly altering their identity as in passing.

Due to the one-drop theory of racial identity, today biracial Americans are confronted by issues irrelevant to unadulterated blacks and whites, much like those of their mulatto antebellum counterparts. But for a trace of black blood, mulatto blacks were in essence members of the mainstream population who, like darker-skinned blacks during the antebellum, yearned for freedom and equality. They thus spent

every waking moment in devising ways to separate themselves from a people who had been defined as inferior by the myth of white supremacy. Their intentions may not have been discriminatory, but the outcome was no less a case of victim-group discrimination. Their efforts to improve their own quality of life necessitated that mulatto blacks submit to the denigration of their own, who in most cases included black family members.

Overt discrimination against black Americans has all but ceased to exist, replaced by more insidious, covert forms. While less dramatic today, discrimination against black Americans is sustained in the modern era, giving biracial Americans no less reason to deny their blackness as was true for their antebellum predecessors. They pass, but not in fear of violence. They form separate communities, but do not openly exclude darker-skinned blacks. They marry exclusively, but are not averse to marrying darker-skinned blacks or socializing with them in the event of some exceptional wealth or notoriety. Succinctly put, biracial Americans—being closer to white—are not given to the overtly racist strategies of the past. However, advocating a separate biracial category in consideration of the social and political implications is a covert means of victim-group discrimination, which encourages a similar outcome.

In the aftermath of white supremacy, mixed-race light skin remains an idealized quality in validating the mulatto, that is, biracial hypothesis. Having benefited from educational and class opportunities that were historically denied to darker-skinned blacks, lighter-skinned, mixed-race, biracial Americans have become beneficiaries of the advantages accorded their ancestors. They are thus conspicuous as graduates of the nation's best educational institutions and occupy prestigious occupational positions. Biracial American women, being more refined through class advantages, have to some extent escaped black denigration and now marry into white populations with little objection.

It goes without saying that not all mulatto blacks abhorred their blackness, as is true today, and that not all biracial Americans are guilty of victim-group discrimination. W.E.B. Du Bois, Thurgood Marshall, and Adam Clayton Powell were a few, whose lives not only transcended discrimination against dark-skinned black Americans but, indeed, rescued black esteem. Darker-skinned blacks are not immune to discrimination against black Americans and biracial Americans. Furthermore, victim-group discrimination against African-Americans is not peculiar to biracial Americans, but is instead a manifestation of dominant-group white power. Until such time as populations can accept a more global model of discrimination, it will prevail as victimism changing only to accommodate the rhetorical traditions of the time.

References

1. Myrdal, G. (1944). *An American dilemma*. New York: Harper & Row.
2. Snowden, F. (1983). *Before color prejudice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
3. Jordan, W. (1981). *The white man's burden*. New York: Oxford University Press.
4. Reuter, B. (1969). *The mulatto in the United States*. New York: Negro Universities Press.
5. Hodes, M. (1997). *White women, black men*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

6. Gatewood, W. (1990). *Aristocrats of color*. Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press.
7. Talty, S. (2003). *Mulatto America*. New York: Harper Collins.
8. Mier, A., & Elliot, R. (1966). *From plantation to ghetto*. New York: Hill & Wang.
9. Woolf, H. (Ed.). (1980). *Webster's new collegiate dictionary*. Springfield, MA: Merriam.
10. Gaudin, W. (2004). Passing for white in Jim Crow America. http://www.jimcrowhistory.org/resources/lessonplans/hs_es_passing_for_white.htm. Accessed 26 June 2009.
11. Kovel, J. (1984). *White discrimination: a psychohistory*. New York: Columbia University Press.
12. Bogle, D. (1973). *Toms, coons, mulattoes, mammies, and mucks: an interpretive history of blacks in American films*. New York: Viking Press.
13. Kroeger, B. (2003). *Passing: when people can't be who they are*. New York: Public Affairs.
14. Myrdal, G. (1944). *An American dilemma*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
15. Hall, R. E. (1990). The projected manifestations of aspiration, personal values, and environmental assessment cognates of cutaneo-chroma (skin color) for a selected population of African Americans (Doctoral dissertation, Atlanta University, 1989). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 50, 3363A.
16. Poussaint, A. (1975, February). The problems of light skinned blacks. *Ebony*, 85.

Chapter 9

Gay and Lesbian Americans: Oppression by the Oppressed

Discrimination against gay and lesbian Americans is a social pathology that extends back to the colonial era, with the arrival to America of the first dominant-group white heterosexual Europeans [1]. While gay and lesbian Americans were much less vocal in the past, the ability of white, heterosexual Europeans to impose their norms upon the gay and lesbian victim-group population was long lasting and not without consequences. For modern gay and lesbian Americans, the legacies of those norms exist as victimism in various forms of discrimination directed particularly at dark-skinned and/or African-descended Americans without respect to gender, class, or sexual orientation [2].

The largest populations of gays and lesbians in America are located in its urban areas. This is not irrelevant to the greater level of tolerance for diversity that has always existed in the nation's cities. Gay and lesbian residence in cities, however, has contributed to a belief on the part of some that gay and lesbian Americans are associated with decadent urban lifestyles. Similar to African-Americans, their experience with discrimination then includes negative stereotypes relevant to their being stigmatized as a deviant out-group, otherwise inferior to the white mainstream population [3]. With stigmatization, white gay and lesbian Americans, as opposed to those of color, are both victims and perpetrators of victim-group discrimination.

Victim-group discrimination is an overwhelming problem in the gay and lesbian community, perpetrated and perpetuated by its white members in particular. The fact is that most anguish, experienced by gays and lesbians of color, is relevant to the issue having been trivialized. That trivialization is dramatic, but not necessarily confusing if it is investigated in the context of the history of the gay and lesbian movements. While the gay and lesbian populations have existed historically, the history of the two movements is credited with the political emergence of the gay and lesbian communities and has been most aptly documented. Unfortunately, victim-group discrimination by white gay and lesbian Americans against similar blacks and others of color reveals the same problem in how gay and lesbian history is characterized, regarding the most significant figures.

In June of 1969, a pivotal moment occurred in the history of American gay and lesbian communities: the Stonewall Riot. Stonewall is the name of a night-club, with homosexual clientele, located in the Greenwich Village section of New York City. The club was frequented by dark-skinned gays and lesbians, plus

others of African and Latino descent. Apparently, a confrontation ensued between club patrons and New York City police, in the process of conducting one of their frequent raids. During the raid, working-class African-American and Latino-American patrons erupted out of frustration and anger over what they felt was an unjust form of harassment and police brutality. They fought back and hence initiated the American gay and lesbian movement. The news media took note in the various photographs and journal accounts of the participants, which appeared nationwide. However, the dark-skinned faces in the riot's mainstay were conspicuously absent from the media reports. African-Americans and Latino-Americans, who rioted on that historic night, are not only absent from photos, but have been completely erased from the annals of the American gay and lesbian history and yearly gay pride events. They have been replaced by white American members of the gay and lesbian communities, who by their social behaviors have proven themselves no less willing to discriminate against darker-skinned Americans than their heterosexual white counterparts.

Americans less sympathetic to the Stonewall Riot or the gay and lesbian movements are likely to regard such an event as insignificant. However, due to the omission of dark-skinned Americans from history of the Stonewall Riot, the trivialization of their role is no less an act of victim-group discrimination by white gay and lesbian Americans. Subsequently, it is the critical omission of these black and brown activists that renders it all but virtually impossible for white gay and lesbian Americans to confront their role in the perpetuation of racism and discrimination that is so prevalent in American society [4]. Suffice it to say that if gay and lesbian persons of color are excluded from the history of their movement, and in effect the decision-making process, white gays and lesbians should not expect support from them or the African-American community as a whole. Their dramatic unwillingness to acknowledge their perpetuation of discriminatory acts and their more insidious participation is best comprehended in the works of C. M. Pierce [5]. According to Pierce, the willingness of white, American gay and lesbians to prioritize their experiences with discrimination as more urgent than the history of brutality suffered by black gays and lesbians is extended from the notion of entitlement dysfunction.

Upon initial observation, the rational mind would be totally confused by the tendency of white, American gays and lesbians to prioritize discrimination by sexual orientation relative to race. However, Pierce contends that the white gay, lesbian, or heterosexual mind is not rational regarding discrimination. The fact of being white in America inclines those so defined to discriminate via a sense of entitlement as a white birthright. Therefore, any discrimination suffered by black Americans or other people of color regardless of their sexual orientation is perceived as trivial when juxtaposed to discrimination against whites. That includes discrimination by race, gender, class, religion, nationality, sexual orientation, and any other demographic where white race is a feature of characteristics. Race being "white" is the ultimate demographic category to which all other categories are subject hence entitlement dysfunction. White gay and lesbian Americans, feeling entitled, apply colonial historical traditions in assessing the implications of discrimination, which is in itself a form of discrimination [6]. Such white Americans, without interference from

formidable other populations, engage in the guiltless discrimination against black Americans in all relevant qualities of life endeavors. Whenever they lose the ability to exercise superior power, they inevitably seek ways to denigrate or invalidate the alternative, such as those who associate anti-gay or anti-lesbian discrimination with antiblack discrimination, despite dramatic differentials in FBI and other source statistical data. Perhaps their objective should be to determine if colonization were to be regarded as a source of shame rather than power, making white gay and lesbian Americans subject to feelings of universal entitlement. This is critical because the West in the coming decades will be witness to intense quality-of-life debates. As our current crisis economy waxes and wanes, destabilizing our quality of life, Americans regardless of race, sexual orientation, or victim-group status will be required to resolve the issue of discrimination or face dire consequences unnecessarily.

The aforementioned conflicts relative to victim-group discrimination illustrate a complex and all too commonplace dynamic directly linked to whites, including gay and lesbian Americans. That is, by virtue of power enabled by significant and tenacious historical events, white gay and lesbian Americans experience entitlement fantasies that validate their oppression of nonwhite peoples. According to Pierce [5], entitlement fantasies may have a major impact upon all human interaction that would predispose culprits to victim-group discrimination. Hence, gay men and lesbian women of European descent developed a universal sense of ownership and superiority that has imposed upon their human interaction with blacks and other people of color for decades, regardless if they are gay, lesbian, or not. Accordingly, white gay and lesbian Americans may then feel entitled to the subjugation of any and all issues less relevant to their quality of life. This entitlement manifests in nightclub etiquette, attractiveness ideals, and their overall exaggerated status in the history of gay and lesbian activism. When designating themselves as the “new black” in gay and lesbian discrimination struggles, white gays and lesbians then feel entitled to bargain totally in white colonial frames of reference. The American social scientist needs to know how this effects and/or reinforces entitlement regarding victim-group discrimination. Similarly, those gay and lesbian Americans who take part in the construction of policy may want to familiarize themselves with the dynamic impact of historical racist events, such as the prevalence of lynching black men upon the current priority of gay and lesbian issues. That consideration as pertains to black gay, lesbian, and heterosexual Americans will expose otherwise unavailable motives. In particular, it will simplify the white gay and lesbian American’s inability to negotiate policies independent of racial interests. Yet having the ability to dominate without any formidable balance in power from minority victim-group populations may encourage white gay and lesbian Americans to a universal sense of entitlement that is ultimately pathological and self-destructive to all.

Because American gay and lesbian victim-group discrimination against dark-skinned African-Americans is a statistical fact, it is documented in the literature of black gays and lesbians and is actualized in the white attractiveness gay and lesbian ideals. It exists not in some archival vacuum or demented fantasy. Quite to the contrary, it is apparent that what white gay and lesbian Americans think or say about

their participation in discrimination follows certain intellectual prescriptions. It is evident by a considerable degree of nuance and elaboration seen as the mechanism of a postcolonial, white super-culture. Thus, most white gay and lesbian Americans dismiss the reality that their discrimination toward black Americans and the trivialization of black issues are advocated in a discriminatory atmosphere. They overlook the explicit connection between that atmosphere and justifications for entitlement advantages, which keeps white activist rhetoric pure. Any effort at all to contest the white status quo has been perceived as crudely iconoclastic. But there is no negating the fact that white gays and lesbians, and America in general, have avoided the effort of seriously bridging the quality-of-life gaps between themselves and all people of color. Much to their dismay, the existence of discrimination in America is rooted not in sexual orientation, gender, class, and so forth but in race vis-à-vis skin color. Race being the ultimate “ism” from which all other forms of discrimination flow is a vehicle by which the white gay and lesbian American community has remained in denial. In the aftermath is a form of victim-group discrimination even more elusive and insidious than the subjugation of black issues as postcolonial entitlement norm: gay and lesbian Americans as the “new black.”

Victim-group discrimination by white gay and lesbian Americans subsequent to the white sense of entitlement extends beyond the heterosexual black community to black members of the gay and lesbian communities themselves. The manner in which the white gay and lesbian movements have chosen to frame issues completely ignores the unique marital issues encountered by gays and lesbians of color. There exists no public discourse to articulate other than white attractiveness ideals, nightclub discrimination, marketing strategies, and race-based romantic rituals that precede partnering. In their passive-aggressive forms of victim-group discrimination, white gays and lesbians have in effect silenced gay and lesbian communities of color. The entitled white gay and lesbian communities, having framed the marriage issue to their preference, have not only silenced the concerns of others but also trivialized their discrimination. The resultant discrimination is no less painful and destructive than that which white gay and lesbian Americans have directed at the black community at large. Their racist sense of entitlement renders it all but impossible for them to comprehend or acknowledge.

Gay and lesbian movements for marriage equality are managed by white leaders, both locally and nationally. According to Irene Monroe, black members of the movement are significant to the extent they can enable “pimping a black page from the civil rights movement for a photo-op moment to push their agenda” [7]. This strategy is not unprecedented in that during the Greenwich Village Stonewall Riot, black and Latino gays and lesbians were prominently featured in the actual event. White gay and lesbian Americans then cast an account of what occurred absent nonwhite activists. Thus, as too often happens, gay and lesbian history succumbs to white entitlement as victim-group discrimination. If African-American gays and lesbians are selectively excluded from the history of their movement and the decision-making that prioritizes issues, white gays and lesbians cannot expect support from black gays and lesbians or the black community at large. Unfortunately, if racial discrimination prevails, unchecked white gays and lesbian Americans

will then have contributed significantly to the oppression of all victim-group populations [8].

Assimilation theory absent domination views sexual orientation as an indicator that being gay or lesbian is not a barrier to full assimilation particularly if one is light-skinned and/or white [9]. An alternate approach sees sexual orientation as a function of inequality in dominant heterosexual racist societies. For light-skinned and/or white gay and lesbian Americans, sexual orientation associated with white issues then becomes their primary concern despite the prevalence of more urgent institutional racism and discrimination against both gay and lesbian African-Americans and other people of color. As members of victimized out-group populations, white gays and lesbians support and take part in discrimination extended from the heterosexual European notions of white supremacy. On that basis, white gays and lesbians are apt to deny black gay and lesbian Americans in employment, in housing, or otherwise discriminate in the normal affairs of life much as racist white heterosexuals [3].

According to the domination model [9] of assimilation, gay and lesbian Americans are regarded similar to minorities and, as such, have been relegated to the fringes of mainstream society. Their most controversial trait is sexual orientation, which unlike race via skin color is not readily apparent by observation. But in a heterosexual culture, a heterosexual orientation is critical to assimilation and equality because assimilation may have an effect upon every phase of life, including job placement and earnings. Unlike race assessed by skin color, sexual orientation is not an obvious "master status" but is of the most primary concern among the gay and lesbian populations. Otherwise, unless a gay or lesbian American is a person of color, they cannot be distinguished from the mainstream of the dominant white heterosexual population. So potent is this fact that it has recently become the focus of a schism between the gay, lesbian, and African-American communities—including black gay and lesbians in their struggles to gain freedom and equality.

Tension between the gay and lesbian communities of color is an indication that discrimination has been particularly pervasive in America, given the negative cultural implications of being dark-skinned or black. That is, both black and white gay and lesbian Americans have internalized the norms of a dominant white racist heterosexual population, but, unlike members of the dominant population, are also the victims of the discrimination in which they may take part. Their willingness to internalize self-destructive norms at whatever risk is not irrelevant to having been persecuted themselves. Their ultimate objective is to improve their quality of life and live out their aspirations. In so doing, gay and lesbian Americans may develop a disdain for other victim-group populations, such as people of color. They might disdain heterosexual black males in particular because that is a norm of the dominant white majority [10]. It is regarded as an obstacle, which might otherwise afford gay and lesbian Americans the opportunity to fully assimilate and improve their quality of life. The stress this reality causes is ever present for black gay and lesbian Americans who must thrive among the dominant white group population and, simultaneously, in the victim-group, white gay and lesbian cultural context as well [11]. Furthermore, since the degree of assimilation by gay and lesbian Americans

closely correlates with their ability to assume racist white norms, discrimination against African-Americans without regard to their sexual orientation has emerged as one of the most critical issues relative to the white American, gay and lesbian quality of life [12]. Succinctly put, similar to other victim-group populations who discriminate, gay and lesbian Americans become predisposed to victim-group discrimination in the aftermath of various prejudices and injustices that are directed historically at nonwhite members of their own community.

A gay or lesbian sexual orientation may become apparent by the time an individual reaches adolescence [13]. The fact that such persons continue to be identified as members of a stigmatized group after adolescence is even more stressful. In their efforts to assimilate, youthful gay and lesbian Americans may also deny their sexual orientation to escape prejudice. This means that they may never reveal themselves or “come out,” not even to their families [14]. It is impossible to accurately measure the pathological affects of this phenomenon, but the fact that it exists is without question [15].

A *U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Report of the Secretary's Task Force on Youth Suicide* report [16] shows that gay and lesbian youth are two to three times more likely to attempt suicide than are heterosexual youth. Additionally, Remafedi, Farrow, and Deisher [17] find that one-third of first attempts occurred in the same year victims revealed their sexual orientation by haphazardly “coming out.” It is no wonder, in such circumstances, that coming out is considered such a dangerous undertaking.

Another study further exemplifies the negative attitudes held by young heterosexual males with respect to gay and lesbian Americans: 89% of the study group regard sex between males “disgusting.” Only 12% of that same group indicate they would befriend a gay or lesbian person [18]. It is such attitudes in America that characterize the dominant heterosexual white population, which dictates cultural norms and can severely injure, through stress, gay and lesbian Americans, young and old, who must assimilate into this hostile, cultural environment.

Accordingly, there is substantial reason for the suggestion of a relationship between sexual orientation and the incident of stress brought by homophobic discrimination. Such stress may be the cause of depression among some as well as high rates of suicide among others [16]. Inevitably, the inability of the dominant white population to assimilate a diversity of groups without incident puts gay and lesbian Americans at risk. Their manifestation of pathologies is symptomatic of a much larger problem in society, the responsibility for which must be assumed by the white dominant-group population [19]. Societal assimilation problems are encouraged by the relentless utilization of a white, heterosexual orientation as the ideal model for what is acceptable. Such rigid bias is not in the best interest of the overall society as it promotes prejudicial norms. Those gay and lesbian Americans who assimilate, by way of internalizing discriminatory white dominant-group norms, impact the ability of all victim groups to overcome discrimination and live viable productive lives, which results in their perpetuation of victimism.

Most adolescents do not understand what it means to be gay or lesbian [3]. In addition, there are few role models available to facilitate their understanding and

implications for discrimination [20]. This further leads to conditions that Hetrick and Martin [21] refer to as social, emotional, and informational isolation. It may be stressful and in extreme cases lead to suicide [16]. According to Vivienne C. Cass [22] and A. K. Maylon [23], avoiding such stress is normally accomplished through denial. Temporary relief is possible when the adolescent not only denies homosexual feelings but accepts them as wrong, while repressing any same sex attractions within themselves [24]. What may follow is the phenomenon of victimism perpetrated by the white victim-group gay or lesbian American whose white predisposition to racism and discrimination against blacks differs little from that of heterosexual white counterparts. It is motivated by the denial process and inspired by the desire to escape the various prejudices directed on the basis of sexual orientation. It is most dramatically illustrated in the unjust forms of sexualized discrimination aimed at heterosexual black males by skin color in particular, which the gay and lesbian American communities have passively endorsed.

Race, being the American “ism” from which all other “isms” derive, defines a dark-skinned American as presumed to be of African descent, black, or a person of color and thus racially nonwhite. Subsequently, race both past and present has been ascertained via skin color as relative to white. In the aftermath, all racial criteria are, in fact, a matter of skin color despite the designations of race in the countless sexualized depictions of black males from the antebellum to the current era.

Relative to the societal sexualization of black males, gay and lesbian victim groups abhor being sexualized by use of the term homosexual to describe their lot. Prior to the age of technology, from era of the Scottsboro boys until now, black males have been sexualized to the point of it having become an American norm. White gay and lesbian Americans, despite being similarly sexualized, have contributed to such sexualization as a manifestation of victim-group discrimination. In rationalizing the sexualized stereotype of modern-day black males, print media thus uses buzz words like nigger, rape, and lynch to evoke passion and anger within the white population. This is evident in the dramatic 1988 political campaign media and Willie Horton.

The Republican Party, which boasts its share of gay and lesbian members, expressed no concern for the sexualized stereotyping of black males, as in the case of Willie Horton. Following World War II, television has become the most powerful form of media to date. Its moving pictures bring images to life in a way that print cannot. More than any other component of modern media, television is by far the most potent for presenting the sexualized stereotype of black males. Since the advent of cable television, virtually every home across America has access to media broadcasts. More so than print, television is intimate. Its ability to drive home the stereotype of the black male was politically exploited in the person of Willie Horton, who had been released from prison on furlough [25]. In the 1988 political campaigns, television ads told how candidate Michael Dukakis was not only opposed to the death penalty but allowed first-degree murderers—showing black man, Willie Horton—to have weekend passes from prison. There was nothing new about this image, but television allowed viewers to “pseudo-experience” Horton.

It was assumed that white citizens, male and female, homosexual and heterosexual would then vote accordingly.

The dynamics of discrimination associated with the campaigns in 1988 were successful because they reflect a general tendency on the part of Americans to view such discrimination as acceptable. No less accepting of discrimination against black males is the white gay and lesbian community, despite their being oppressed for different reasons. This community has harbored a criminal stereotype of black males without due process. On occasion and, despite their being innocent of the crimes, black males suffer accusations, as in the 1989 case of Charles Stuart and William Bennett.

In 1989, a Boston crime involved a white male named Charles Stuart, who shot and killed his pregnant wife and then accused a black male of being the culprit. This incident, where a black male was accused of murdering a white woman, occupied the front pages of American news media for weeks. A black male was arrested. The entire nation assumed the guilt of the accused based upon media hype and its larger-than-life photographs of the murder scene. Only after one of the accomplices involved in the frame-up revealed the truth, that the white husband was the murderer, was William Bennett—the alleged dark-skinned perpetrator—released from police custody [26]. The belief that Bennett was guilty was arguably, in large part, a reaction to black males having been institutionally sexualized as a societal threat.

The sexualized stereotype of black males in America has been institutionalized to the extent that it has recently begun to influence criminal justice responses to black male children. According to CNN reporter John Zarrella [27], law enforcement personnel in Tampa, Florida, were responsible for the 2006 death of a 14-year-old child, a black male named Martin Lee Anderson. The child reportedly died at the hands of adult male officers after passing out at the Bay County Sheriff's Office Boot Camp for juvenile offenders. Anderson had complained to officers of breathing problems, but was ignored on his first day at the facility. Review of videotape clearly illustrates the adult male officers beating the child and using various take-down methods, including kneeling his thighs, putting pressure points to his ear, and punches to his arms. According to the officers, the child had resisted orders and run away. For this reason, they determined him to be uncooperative, after which the child later died. Initially, law enforcement officers insisted the child's death was due to "natural" sickle cell causes based upon autopsy. The boy's parents demanded a second autopsy, which determined that "natural" causes did not result in the child's death. According to the coroner, sickle-cell traits had nothing to do with the black child's death. The second autopsy was confirmed by attorney Mark Ober, who was directing the investigation into the child's death, and who had also demanded the second autopsy. In addition to the child's family, other medical personnel took issue with the first autopsy as well. Some accused the officers of murder, which in part accommodated investigation and a second autopsy. Aside from local efforts, a federal investigation has been ordered to determine whether the child's civil rights had been violated by officers, who used excessive force. The investigation was at the request of the child's parents and local leaders. Currently, no charges have been filed against the officers involved, but the juvenile facility has been closed. According to

local law enforcement officials, the closing had nothing to do with the case and the eight officers directly involved had their employment terminated.

These incidents reflect the ease with which Americans can perceive African-American males as criminals and not full participatory citizens. However, empirical research findings underscore that black males, more than any other demographic group including gay and lesbian Americans, are in danger from criminal justice institutions. Consider the following social facts: although African-Americans constitute less than a quarter of the total US population, blacks comprise almost half of the state prison population [28]. Moreover, in Michigan, blacks comprise 53% of the state's male prison population. Such deplorable facts have been tolerated historically in America because discrimination against black Americans has been perceived as justified by an innate national hatred. That hatred is so potent as to visit pathological consequences upon the quality of life experienced by African-Americans of both genders, all classes, and sexual orientations. This fact is quantitatively demonstrated in the previously mentioned rates of FBI hate crime statistics [See Table 3.1], which are a reflection of local law enforcement as well.

Local law enforcement institutions that are assigned the task of maintaining civil public discourse have taken part in discrimination against black males, indicative of its universal acceptance as with gay and lesbian Americans. This is illustrated in an April 2006 case reported by Kevin Grasha [29], of the *Lansing State Journal*. A black male has been accused of shooting a local Eaton County Sheriff's Department sergeant. The alleged victim, according to prosecutors, was not shot by a black male, but in actuality had shot himself. According to the sergeant, shortly after 3 am he was shot in the right arm while patrolling in the vicinity of West Town Plaza, located near West Saginaw Highway. Immediately, the local police took control of neighborhoods and school buildings, conducting a massive manhunt that extended into daybreak. An estimated 40 or more police officers from approximately six area departments plus a helicopter participated in the manhunt.

The Eaton County Sheriff's Department released a description of the assailant to the news media, describing him as a black male, about 6 feet in height, with "muscles." He was said to be in his mid-20 s, had a relative dark skin color compared to whites, with "pockmarks" about his face. Unfortunately, this description was also inaccurate because the sergeant's shooting description was a deliberate fabrication. The police department released an artist's sketch of the fabricated assailant, which it has since retracted. To ensure an objective investigation, the local department turned the case over to the Michigan State Police. Eaton County law enforcement insisted that they had acted with the "highest professional standards."

The sergeant was eventually charged with filing a false report, arraigned in the Eaton County District Court, and faced a maximum sentence of 4 years in the penitentiary. He was also liable for any costs incurred by other agencies that responded to calls for apprehension. The sergeant was placed under observation at a local hospital; some would argue that his actions were a psychotic anomaly. On July 22, 2008, the Michigan Court of Appeals unanimously affirmed the convictions and sentences of the former sergeant. In actuality, societal circumstances suggest that African-Americans are indeed a disposal victim-group population whose status does

not equate with that of the white community. This belief is embraced not only by the white gay and lesbian American communities but via victim-group discrimination by some blacks as well. It is objectively illustrated in the statistical quality-of-life indicators.

Correlating quality-of-life indicators such as employment may be directly linked to an unwritten hierarchy whereby white gay and lesbian Americans feel entitled to a desired quality of life as white postcolonial birthright. Their sense of entitlement is a form of victim-group discrimination, as reflected in governmental black/white employment statistics. For the years 1992–2001, the US Department of Labor compiled the following unemployment data, showing that when considering government compiled employment data, whites lead blacks in all preferred quality-of-life categories. The quality-of-life advantages attributed to white Americans does not exclude the white gay and lesbian communities as a matter of statistical fact [30] (Tables 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 9.4, and 9.5).

Despite government statistics, white gays, lesbians, and other white Americans are quite adamant about the unfair nature of the workplace in providing black Americans with an employment advantage. However, empirical data do not support their contention. As with tradition, black Americans have encountered overt discrimination that has enabled all whites to experience a superior quality of life

Table 9.1 According to these results, black unemployment was more than twice that of whites for each year calculated (A)

(A) % Unemployment by race		
Year	White	Black
1992	6.6	14.2
1993	6.1	13.0
1994	5.3	11.5
1995	4.9	10.4
1996	4.7	10.5
1997	4.2	10.0
1998	3.9	08.9
1999	3.7	08.0
2000	3.5	07.6
2001	4.2	08.7

Source: Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics [31]

Table 9.2 Education does not seem to equalize the black/white unemployment gap, as 2.5% of college-educated blacks were unemployed in 2000 compared to 1.4% of whites for the same year (B)

(B) % Unemployed by college educated and race		
Year	White	Black
1992	2.7	4.8
1995	2.3	4.1
1999	1.7	3.3
2000	1.4	2.5

Source: Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics [31]

Table 9.3 In 2000, 5.8% of whites simultaneously held multiple jobs while 5.2% of blacks did likewise (C)

(C) %Multiple jobholders by race		
Year	Black	White
2000	5.2	5.8

Source: Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics [31]

Table 9.4 Black and white employment differentials are no less dramatic than income. The median weekly income for whites consistently exceeded that for blacks during the years 1985, 1990, 1995, and 2000 (D)

(D) Median weekly income by race and year		
Year	White (\$)	Black (\$)
1985	355	277
1990	424	329
1995	494	383
2000	591	468

Source: Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics [31]

Table 9.5 What is most astounding about these statistics is that by 1999 almost one quarter of white American households earned \$75,000 or more per year (E)

(E)% Household income \$75,000 + a year by race		
Year	Black	White
1970	3.6	10.9
1980	5.0	14.1
1985	6.6	16.9
1990	7.6	18.7
1995	8.0	19.1
1996	8.2	19.7
1997	8.5	21.0
1998	10.0	22.1
1999	12.6	23.7

Source: Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics [31]

through employment. Subsequently, labor market discrimination against blacks increased by about 2% a year from 1973 to 1979 [30]. Furthermore, income by autonomous wage growth (increases in income as a result of changes that occurred because of some factor other than changes in individual attributes, such as changes in macroeconomic policy or labor market institutions) for whites was 1.7% per year from 1968 to 1973 [30]. From 1979 to 1991, it was minus 1% (-.01) per year, despite being Affirmative Action years. Autonomous wage growth among black Americans was twice that of whites from 1968 to 1973: 3.5% [30]. Unfortunately, autonomous wage growth decreased significantly for blacks from 1973 to 1979 at minus 0.6% (-.06). Qualifications cannot totally explain away wage differentials between white and black Americans.

Between 1968 and 1991, it is plausible that 3–39% of the racial wage gap can be assessed due to legitimate factors [30]. By objective reasoning, at least 50% of the racial wage gap is purely a result of racial discrimination [30]. Moreover, the aforementioned statistics conflict with postcolonial traditionalists such as Herrnstein and Murray [32], who imply that interracial differences in income between black and white Americans are biogenetically determined. The evidence herewith is obvious that the increase in income inequality between blacks and whites was undoubtedly the result of an increase in racial discrimination [30]. Thus, while government data note the unemployment, job discrimination, and employment advantages of postcolonial whites, traditionalists cannot acknowledge this as reality. Their power group status then dampens the boundary between what is real and what is contrived. Yet white American, gay and lesbian activists insist they have no recollection of their victim-group discrimination, directed at African-Americans. The criminalized sexualization of black males of any age does not equate a priority for white gay and lesbian Americans. In fact, they contend that they are the “new blacks,” because of a culture that has oppressed gay and lesbian Americans on the basis of sexual orientation. According to Tat [8], the white gay and lesbian American communities are no less discriminatory in their regard for dark-skinned, nonwhite peoples than the mainstream white, heterosexual Americans. However, providing information to support Tat’s contention presents a formidable challenge. While a gay or lesbian community has likely existed all through history, empirical evidence to substantiate their acts of victim-group discrimination pales in comparison to people of color and other victim groups. Subsequently, victim-group discrimination among gays and lesbians can only be inferred from data pertaining to the white population. As such, the anecdotes of Tat and others are intended to illustrate the existence of a pattern of discrimination that might make plausible their victim-group transgressions.

The FBI maintains hate crime statistics, which compare offences against American gay and lesbian communities in comparison to the black community. The most biased of observers would conclude that the number of hate crimes committed against gay and lesbian Americans (1460) is dwarfed by those committed on the basis of race (4724).

Sexual-orientation bias: In 2007, law enforcement agencies reported 1460 hate crime offenses based on sexual-orientation bias. Of these offenses:

- 59.2% were classified as anti-male homosexual bias.
- 24.8% were reported as anti-homosexual bias.
- 12.6% were prompted by an anti-female homosexual bias.
- 1.8% were the result of an anti-heterosexual bias.
- 1.6% were classified as anti-bisexual bias.

Racial bias: In 2007, law enforcement agencies reported that 4724 single-bias hate crime offenses were racially motivated. Of these offenses:

- 69.3% were motivated by antiblack bias.
- 18.4% stemmed from antiwhite bias.

- 6.0% were a result of bias against groups of individuals consisting of more than one race (anti-multiple races, group).
- 4.6% resulted from anti-Asian/Pacific Islander bias.
- 1.6% were motivated by anti-American Indian/Alaskan Native bias [33].

Tat [34] has described the American gay and lesbian communities as among the most diverse in the nation. Their membership boasts of Caucasians, Asian-Americans, African-Americans, Latino-Americans, Christians, and even Atheists. This diverse population shares a common demographic in their sexual orientation. As a victim-group population that has faced historic discrimination, it would seem logical that they would be less inclined to discriminate against others. In fact, among members of its own community, those gays or lesbians who are white express particular prejudices against African-Americans or darker-skinned gays or lesbians. According to Tat, this is racism, one of the oldest forms of discrimination in America.

Racism is not at the forefront of issues in the white gay and lesbian communities, but it is a no less formidable issue. Black gays and lesbians, similar to black males, have lives imposed upon by pronounced levels of discrimination not experienced by their white counterparts. What is more, the discrimination black gay and lesbians experience comes not from mainstream society alone but in many instances from the gay or lesbian community itself. This form of victim-group discrimination is most apparent, according to Tat, in gay and lesbian bars and nightclubs. Similar to the type of discrimination encountered by blacks, black gays and lesbians attending white gay or lesbian establishments are confronted with blatant accounts of discrimination, perpetrated by their white counterparts, as reported by Tat:

Brad, a gay male, recounts his experience on DeJa News, a popular newsgroup. Brad is Caucasian and his boyfriend is African American. Brad's brother and brother in law are also African American. After finishing pool one evening, they decided to visit an after hours club. When Brad checked on the entrance fees, he was quoted a lesser price then when his boyfriend did the same. In another case, Vince tells his story on the *Advocate* on-line. He, Caucasian, and his Filipino lover both received different treatment based upon their skin color. 'I had no problem with the entry guard, but he hassled my Filipino lover, finally demanding a passport' stated Vince. In the April issue of *OUT*, in an article titled 'Boy Troubles,' Ken states that 'When I go to bars or those huge clubs where it's nothing but white middle-class, muscular guys, I don't feel like I'm even gay at all' [34].

To the typical white, American gay or lesbian person, the aforementioned problems are all but irrelevant because they are directed at black and/or gay and lesbians of color. An equally dramatic display of white gay or lesbian discrimination is in the fact that black gay men, by virtue of being black and perhaps dark-skinned, are considered less attractive than lighter-skinned, Caucasian gay men. The application of white attractiveness ideals to demean gay black men is replicated in the application of white ideals of feminine beauty to demean black and other women of color. Many similar issues are ignored or trivialized relative to white gay and lesbian victim-group discrimination because such oppression is limited to people of color.

The resultant emotional suffering has not gone unnoticed by gay men of color. Tat reports the following accounts of such an incident:

Every time I go to a gay bar, being the darky, indio-looking Mexican American I am, not one Anglo boy hits on me. A similar incident was experienced on-line. Bob was in an on-line chat room and someone requested to talk to him. His very first sentence was, 'Are you white?' Bob replied that he was not and he then finished with a 'thank you, bye.' Bob was curious and looked up his profile. The other person was Caucasian [34].

I have written extensively [35] about victim-group discrimination regarding skin color, attributed not only to whites but among people of color toward one another. The mainstream scholarship in the form of its traditional discrimination has responded with hegemony by the conspicuous absence of skin color discrimination from major journals and other scholarly sources. In fact, victim-group discrimination by skin color is pervasive to the extent of existing among American gays and lesbians of color as well. The same skin color hierarchy that is internalized by heterosexual people of color, blacks against blacks, and other people of color against those darker-skinned is no less prevalent among gay and lesbian Americans. Tat [34] reports the following scenario:

A friend of mine, who is Asian, attended a school dance that was hosted by the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Association at UCSD. There, he met and befriended another gay Asian male. When my friend asked him out on a date, his reply was that he only liked white guys. This problem causes others to feel bad because they consider themselves less worthy. Vince states in the *Advocate* idea exchange that he '...get(s) that old feeling of being a sub-standard couple because Leon (his lover) is not white.' This idea that one race is more attractive has become deadly in that it effects everyone, even the people trying to fight this notion. If a colored gay male, who is fighting to overcome this problem, falls for a Caucasian gay male, is he being hypocritical? [34].

Gay and lesbian Americans are unlikely to accept the fact of victim-group discrimination, as perpetuated within their own community. They would prefer instead to focus upon the discrimination that they experience from the heterosexual population as it releases them from responsibility of their own acts and is the more important issue from the white gay and lesbian American perspectives. Unfortunately, the evidence to the contrary is overwhelming. The aforementioned anecdotes are subject to challenge because they are scenarios that can be embellished without subjection to scrutiny. However, gay and lesbian advertising is tangible and can be scrutinized for victim-group discrimination, which many in the white gay and lesbian communities refuse to acknowledge.

Marketing companies are multimillion-dollar business enterprises. Whom they hire to represent various commercial products reflect the ideals of both the gay community and society at large. Commensurate with victim-group discrimination are the dramatic prejudices acted out in the selection of advertisement models. As expected, the majority of ads employ white gays and lesbians as the preferred ideal. Such discrimination may even exceed that of the mainstream heterosexual community. In fact, gay and lesbian advertisements employ whites 90% of the time [34]. The fact that the gay and lesbian communities are at least as diverse as the mainstream community suggests that blacks are excluded intentionally as a manifestation

of victim-group discrimination. Black gay and lesbian Americans report feeling an overwhelming inadequacy at the thought of that discouraging fact [34].

You begin to feel bad because you do not look like the guys in the magazine. You also feel especially bad when you are not represented in these ads. While using only white male models creates a sense of what is beautiful, it also subliminally creates the notion of what is not. If I do not see myself represented, I am more likely to think that I can lift weights and exercise so I can look like what I see but there is no way I can make myself appear like another race (well at least nothing that would not be natural) [8].

In an effort to promote gay and lesbian rights, some such Americans have elected to equate their movement and struggles with those of African-Americans and civil rights. However, according to Irene Monroe, who is an African-American lesbian [36], "If you are African American and gay, and fighting alongside your white brothers and sisters for queer civil rights, the notion that 'Gay is the new black' is not only absurdly arrogant, it is also dangerously divisive" [36]. Gay and lesbian Americans are members of a despised victim out-group, whose historical struggles for equality and civil rights are justified on all moral grounds. However, white American gays and lesbians have benefited from their whiteness, in a racist culture that defines all nonwhite groups as inferior. Black gay and lesbian Americans have thus suffered from discrimination as a consequence of their race and less so for their sexual orientation. In addition, white gay and lesbian Americans have proven themselves no less willing to discriminate against nonwhite Americans than the white heterosexual mainstream. In fact, evidence suggests that white lesbians harbor a visceral hatred for heterosexual black males, in particular as a dramatic illustration of their victim-group discrimination.

In the aftermath of Barack Obama's election to the presidency of the United States, many would prefer to assume that racial or skin color discrimination no longer exists. As it pertains to gay and lesbian Americans and their efforts to gain marriage equality, racism prevails—while treating African-Americans as second-class allies in the history of their struggle. Subsequently, black gays and lesbians bond with the heterosexual black community cognizant that the primary issue is not sexual orientation but race. True to their victim-group discrimination, white gay and lesbian Americans, according to Monroe [36], have assigned blame for the failure of California's Proposition 8 on the black community. The historical prejudice directed at both the heterosexual and homosexual black communities by white gay and lesbian Americans has further polarized the two groups, whose ultimate objective is aspiration to the same quality-of-life opportunities extended to the mainstream heterosexual white community. The discrimination associated with the marriage equality issue is that it has been selected as the primary focus of the gay and lesbian movements. The not-so-subtle implication is that black pain and suffering is trivialized and otherwise relegated to the less important. Such discrimination conforms to the white entitlement model, similar to the trivialization of black issues in academe. This resort to arrogance, according to Monroe, is destructive. By advocating a single white-inspired agenda, which ignores coalition building with the black community, gay and lesbian Americans contribute to victim-group discrimination and the ultimate demise of both.

As with the aforementioned accounts of victim-group discrimination perpetuated by white gay and lesbian Americans, one should not construe insignificance of anti-gay or anti-lesbian bias. All members of American demographic out-groups suffer some form of discrimination and, unfortunately, engage in acts of discrimination themselves. However, by virtue of their being white, white gay and lesbian Americans among all out-group populations present the most formidable and potentially explosive problem with victim-group discrimination. Being white as per white supremacy carries an unspoken license of superiority in Western society, which extends to every level of human interaction. Thus, being gay or lesbian is subject to heterosexual job discrimination. Being a black gay or lesbian woman is subject to heterosexual and white gay or lesbian job discrimination. Being a black woman is subject to discrimination in the application of white physical ideals. Being a black gay or lesbian is subject to discrimination in the application of white physical ideals, which includes that from white gays and lesbians. Being gay or lesbian is subject to discrimination by heterosexual Americans in the rejection of marriage equality, by other gay and lesbian issues, and by white gay and lesbian Americans discriminating against interracial gay and lesbian couples.

Victim-group discrimination acted out by white gay or lesbian Americans must be eliminated before gay and lesbian Americans can wage an effective struggle for their rights. Their tension-riddled relationship with the black and other communities of color must give way to constructive partnerships directed at the ultimate attainment of common goals. Most of all, white gay and lesbian Americans must be willing to attribute the responsibility for discrimination and the oppression of all not to African-Americans but the white racial population into which they themselves were born.

References

1. Montalvo, F. (1987). *Skin color and Latinos: The origins and contemporary patterns of ethno-racial ambiguity among Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans* (monograph), San Antonio, TX: Our Lady of the Lake University.
2. Harrison, D., & Pennel, R. (1989). Contemporary sex roles for adolescents: new options or confusion. *Journal of Social Work and Human Sexuality*, 8(1), 27–45.
3. Martin, A., & Hetrick, E. (1988). The stigmatization of the gay and lesbian adolescents. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 15(1/2), 163–181.
4. Hall, R. (2003). *Discrimination among oppressed populations*. Lewiston, NY: Mellen.
5. Pierce, C. (1978). Entitlement dysfunctions. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 12, 215–219.
6. Kochman, T. (1976). Perceptions along the power axis: a cognitive residue of interracial encounters. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 18(6), 261–273.
7. Monroe, I. (2009). Gay is not the new black. *Huffington Post*. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/irene-monroe/gay-is-emnotem-the-new-bl_b_151573.html. Accessed 4 April 2009.
8. Tat, H. (2009). Racism in gay culture. <http://www.tatmultimedia.com/Webistes/Journal/>. Accessed 7 April 2009.
9. Kitano, H. (1985). *Race relations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
10. Loiacano, D. (1989). Gay identity issues among black Americans: racism, homophobia and the need for validation. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 68, 21–25.

11. Harry, H. (1993). Being out: a general model. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 26(1), 25–39.
12. Condry, J. (1984). Gender identity and social competence. *Sex Roles*, 2(5/6), 485–511.
13. Troiden, R., & Goode, E. (1980). Variables related to the acquisition of a gay identity. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 5(4), 383–392.
14. MacDonald, G. (1983). Exploring sexual identity: gay people and their families. *Sex Education Coalition News*, 5(1), 4.
15. Savin-Williams, R. (1989). Coming out to parents and self esteem among gay and lesbian youths. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 18(1/2), 1–35.
16. Gibson, P. (1989). *Gay male and lesbian youth suicide*. In *US Department of Health and Human Services Report of the Secretary's task force on youth suicide: prevention and interventions in youth suicide*. Vol. 3. Rockville, MD: US Department of Health and Human Services.
17. Remafedi, G., Farrow, J., & Deisher, R. (1991). Risk factors in attempted suicide in gay and lesbian youth. *Pediatrics*, 87(6), 869–876.
18. Marsiglio, W. (1993). Attitudes toward homosexual activist and gays as friends: a national survey of heterosexual 15–19-year-old heterosexual males. *Journal of Sex Research*, 30, 12–17.
19. Bell, A., Wienberg, M., & Hammersmith, S. (1981). *Sexual preference: its development in men and women*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
20. Hetrick, E., & Martin, A. (1987). Developmental issues and their resolution for gay and lesbian adolescents. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 2(1/2), 25–43.
21. Hetrick, E., & Martin, A. (1987). Developmental issues and their resolution for gay and lesbian adolescents. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 2(1/2), 25–43.
22. Cass, V. (1979). Homosexual identity formation: a theoretical model. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 4(3), 219–235.
23. Maylon, A. K. (1981). The homosexual adolescent: developmental issues and social bias. *Child Welfare*, 15(5), 321–330.
24. Newman, B., & Muzzonigro, P. (1993). The effects of traditional family values on the coming out process of gay male adolescents. *Adolescence*, 28(109), 213–226.
25. Schram, M. (1990, May). The making of Willie Horton. *New Republic*, 202, 17–19.
26. Carlson, M. (1990, January 22). Presumed innocent. *Time*, 10–14.
27. Zarrella, J. (2006). Boot camp death not natural, second autopsy finds. <http://www.cnn.com/2006/LAW/03/14/bootcamp.death/>. Accessed 13 May 2009.
28. Harrison, P., & Beck, A. (2005). *Prison and jail inmates at midyear 2004*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin, (NCJ208801), Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, 1–14.
29. Grasha, K. (2006). Lutz to undergo mental testing. *Lansing State Journal*, 1A.
30. Mason, P. (1998). Race, cognitive ability, and wage inequality. *Challenge*, 41(3), 63–84.
31. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2002). Washington, DC. Available at <http://www.bls.gov/opub/>. Accessed 26 June 2009.
32. Herrnstein, R., & Murray, C. (1994). *The bell curve*. New York: Free Press.
33. Federal Bureau of Investigation (2007). Hate crime statistics. <http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/hc2007/incidents.htm>. Accessed 8 April 2009.
34. Tat, H. (2009). Racism in gay culture. <http://www.tatmultimedia.com/Webistes/Journal/> Accessed 7 April 2009.
35. Hall, R. (2006). The bleaching syndrome among people of color: implications of skin color for human behavior in the social environment. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 13(3), 19–31.
36. Monroe, I. (2009). Gay is not the new black. Huffington Post. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/irene-monroe/gay-is-emnotem-the-new-bl_b_151573.html Accessed 4 April 2009.

Chapter 10

Women: Better White than Male

America is a patriarchal culture, wherein women have been traditional second-class citizens. As a result, all women regardless of race, class, or immigrant status are members of an oppressed victim-group population. That membership defines women as a victimized out-group minority, whose quality of life is contingent upon and directed for the most part by men. In the development of policy, law, and overall behavior, men act foremost in the best interest of other men, generally at the expense of women. However, the implications of victim-group discrimination regarding race by skin color are no less dramatic for women than within the so-called races. As a nation dominated by European ethnic groups, American white women among all women have resorted to victim-group discrimination against women and people of color as an historical extension of white supremacy. They have advocated their superiority following the antebellum, not on the basis of equality with men of color but superiority to all nonwhite populations on the basis of race, which includes all but the white-male power structure. They seek equality only with white men as a presumed birthright of white supremacy. An account of their activism is documented in the history of the seldom-acknowledged precursor to the feminist and/or women's rights movement—the white Women's Ku Klux Klan (WKKK).

The history of women's rights and what would lead to feminism in America evolved in the historical context of antebellum racism, apparent in the popularity of the larger Ku Klux Klan (KKK) [1]. Extended from the Klan's racist objectives, white women—in particular the middle class—discriminated against people of color, that is, black, Asian-, Latino-, and Native Americans. Modern-day academe has been reluctant to acknowledge this apparent victim-group discrimination by white women through Klan ideals, but its manifestation is available for investigation in the documented history of the WKKK.

The WKKK was a precursor to the women's rights and feminist movements in that initially it was comprised entirely of Protestant, white, American women who recognized no relevancy in the struggles of black folk or other people of color. Their objectives were equality for white women at the expense of all nonwhites if and when necessary. Thus, white women of the WKKK espoused racial segregation, quotas for immigrants, and the “eternal supremacy of the white race” [1]. They differed little politically from the Ku Klux Klan (KKK) except for one conspicuous detail: The WKKK incorporated the racist agenda of the KKK for the

eventual realization of equal rights between men and “white Protestant women” [1]. Furthermore, they objected to miscegenation, not for the white male raping of black and Native women, but because such liaisons diminished the appeal of white women to white men. This apathy for the abuses suffered by women of color was one of the first acts of victim-group discrimination perpetrated by women (white) against nonwhite victim-group populations in America.

The eventual waxing and waning of the WKKK was commensurate with changes in the KKK. However, the struggles of white women for rights equal to those of white men have remained consistent as an historical objective of women’s rights. According to Louise Newman [2], white women in the Progressive era sought greater participation in the political domain relative to white men based upon their Protestant white identity. Hence, Newman [2] contends that “. . . by emphasizing a racial and cultural superiority shared with Protestant white men and by claiming special roles as women civilizers of racially inferior peoples” (they could accomplish this feat) [2]. Racist rhetoric was utilized in their objectives, including discourses borrowed from eugenics biology, which substantiated the evolution of white Americans as the assumed superior race made obvious by their relative light skin color.

One of the luminaries of the initial women’s rights movement during the Progressive era was Alice Fletcher. Fletcher was an anthropologist who attempted to apply racist notions of white superiority to Native Americans. In doing so, according to Newman [2], Fletcher insisted that Native American women forfeit the freedom and status accorded them by Native culture and accept subordination to Native American men as a means to their being civilized [2]. In this way, they might eventually aspire to the same superior biological evolution as the lighter-skinned white race.

Charlotte Perkins Gilman was perhaps the most influential of all white women during the Progressive era. Gilman was regarded as the principal scholar of her time among white women, within the environment of thinkers who influenced her and with whom she sought discourse [2]. Gilman believed that the restricted roles of white women impeded the evolution of the white race. She thought white women invested entirely too much time on domestic activities when their advanced biological development would allow them to contribute in a more specialized fashion and help further develop the race. What is more, Gilman criticized white men for sexual exploitation of black women, not for their participation in institutionalized rape but its disruption of white propagation. For this reason and others according to Gilman, white women should be allowed equal rights with white men that they might “take charge” of mate selection in benefit to future offspring.

Activism on the part of white women dissipated in the WKKK and re-emerged in the newly evolving profession of social work. The appearance of justice and equality advocated by white, female social workers was little more than victim-group covert racism by those not associated with the WKKK. As pertains to race via skin color, white women engaged in confrontations with black female activists who were well aware of the contradictions between white women’s rhetoric and their actions relative to the lynching of black men. In the heyday of lynching, Ida B. Wells, co-editor

and part owner of the Memphis black weekly newspaper, was one of the most active and eloquent spokespersons against it. Wells was a black woman, born a slave in Mississippi, who investigated lynching and published her findings in black-owned print media. She was regarded by some as the lead opponent of lynching—the most insidious form of white racism. Her investigations shed light on the liaisons between black men and white women that were, in her words, “Voluntary, clandestine and illicit” [3].

In 1892, Wells published an editorial warning Southern white men that their continued acts of violence would result in damage to the reputations of white women. No response occurred because the American concept of social justice being racist did not extend to black folk. Black folk were considered inferior in every way and thus exempt from the lofty credo reserved for other Americans. Hence, racism was the vehicle by which whites made lynching the norm [4]. Victim groups such as white women, who would otherwise have objected to the lynching of their own by way of victimism, stood silent for a variety of reasons. Southern lynch mobs threatened Wells’ life for speaking out. White journalists who sided with racists in an attempt to justify violence wrote: “Every negro lynched is a big, burly, black brute” [5]. In fact, as Wells had known, many of those who met such a tragic death had been the sons of white men. They were neither black nor burly, but were sufficiently attractive for white girls of culture and refinement to fall in love with.

Much to the apathy of white women, black women had also been subjected to the violence of lynch mobs. However, as victims they were more likely to be raped or assaulted by white men, a form of sexual violence that provoked neither legal nor extralegal retribution on the part of the law-abiding white community—including activist white women. Black women were used as a rationale by racists for the lynching of black men in that they were assumed responsible for the supposed criminality of their sons and husbands.

Despite considerable activism by Wells and other blacks, white women as community activists were not moved to action by the murdering of black men. In the same era, what would come to be known as the profession of social work was an emerging grassroots movement that rallied to bring social justice to the masses of oppressed populations [6]. The grassroots effort to provide for self was apparent in the black community as an extension of black culture. Contrary to white culture, in which individualism and competition are emphasized, mutual aid was emphasized in the black community. It relied upon cooperation rather than competition, as reflected in black views on poverty, welfare, the ill fed, and exchange networks [7]. Furthermore, the extent of white racism ensured that any provisions that might be available from federal or local governments would be denied to blacks. Hence, in the grassroots black community, mutual aid societies functioned as welfare agencies from which the genesis of social work evolved. Among the notable were members of the Masons, Odd Fellows, Knights of Pythias, and the Galilean Fisherman [8]. They fed the hungry, cared for the sick, supported the unemployed, and provided death benefits to widows without any intervention whatsoever from white interests. The leadership, recipients, and origin of resources were a collective grassroots effort by

the black community that the victim group within the white community attempted to destroy at every opportunity.

In the same year that Wells published her editorial, one of her closest friends, Thomas Moss, was murdered, along with other black men who ran a successful grocery store in Memphis. Their businesses took profits away from a nearby store that was owned by a white proprietor. After arming themselves against the threat of a white attack, the black storeowners were arrested and jailed, then kidnapped and shot to death in the dark of night. Moss was lynched, accompanied by his closest colleagues [3]. All this occurred while the leadership of a white woman, Jane Addams, in another part of the country, advocated vociferously against oppression and for social justice. Unfortunately, its grassroots influence had begun to wane, ushering in the first among the white, female, social work intellectuals who would replace activism with rhetoric; Addams' rhetoric lacked the racist tones of lynch mobs, but her inactions were no less victimism. Ida B. Wells sought support from Jane Addams.

Jane Addams was representative of the prototype bourgeois intellectual who played a major role in the social work leadership. She espoused the rhetoric of equal opportunity and social justice for all while living segregated from blacks who would have found respite in such words. Addams' father was regarded as the wealthiest and most prominent person in their village. College educated, she lived in the largest house in her community, and the material advantages Addams had were obvious. Her community, which included immigrants, contained no racial diversity and nearly everyone was a Protestant. Some of the village girls, most of whom were lower class, worked as domestics in the Addams household. They labored diligently despite the aristocratic air that permeated the Addams' home [9].

White social workers and historians have attempted to rescue the life of Jane Addams from the racism of her times. They have characterized her as sympathetic and understanding of blacks and black issues. In fact, by her victim-group apathy Addams was no less a racist than the southern mobs who lynched any number of innocent black victims. Thus, according to some: "She did not entirely avoid the racist attitudes of her day, but she came much closer to overcoming them than most of...her generation" [9]. Addams kept black company on occasion, but most of these were bourgeois leaders like she. Booker T. Washington was among the noted black/mulatto/biracial victim-group accommodationists. Washington was the son of a white man and his black female slave servant. No doubt, as a black man, Washington was not among the racists of his time, but he facilitated racism in victimism by spearheading efforts to keep blacks subservient to whites, for which he was soundly criticized by W. E. B. Du Bois [10].

Jane Addams actively advocated social justice for millions of newly arrived white immigrants in Chicago [11]. She expressed little sympathy for the lynching and murdering of American citizens who happened to be black and/or dark-skinned. After constant prodding from Wells, Addams eventually and tacitly opposed the lynching of black men. Wells responded with anger to Addams' passive rhetoric [3]. Despite criticism and victim-group discrimination, Addams eventually became one of the first and most prominent intellectuals to influence the redirection of social

work from grassroots, self-help, and activism to institutional racism, evident in the priorities of social work today.

No doubt, articulation of the historical role of the women's rights movement in the racist oppression and victim-group discrimination against people of color will be the grist of controversy [12]. Some in the academy will argue that to investigate the unspeakable issue of victim-group discrimination by race and/or skin color versus gender will do more harm than good because the issue today is so provocative. But what they fail to realize is that confronting such a provocative topic is a civil and socially appropriate way to rescue academe and society at large from the historical perils of modern victim-group discrimination. The dictates of victim-group discrimination, by white women subsequent to their racist origins, have resulted in their preferred faculty hiring to sustain the prestige and validity of the unspoken traditions of white supremacy. This is significant because the influences of academe are significant in what is deemed culturally justified. While white women are not the sole determining factor in faculty hires, they too often join white men in bringing about the biased results to which few have expressed active objection.

A recent investigation was conducted, of women (white) and people of color (black) employed as faculty at Ivy League institutions. While women and people of color have made minimal progress, statistical data confirm a much greater ability on the part of white women to gain employment at such prestigious institutions despite their being members of an oppressed, victim-group population. According to the *New York Times* [13], 433 professors were hired into full-time positions on Ivy League campuses. Of that number, 14 were listed as African-American and a mere 8 as Latino. The same data for women as a whole accounted for 150 positions. This is so, despite accusations of urgency on the part of modern women's groups. Data for the investigation were extrapolated from a federal source compiled by a Yale graduate student. In the aftermath of recent controversial statements by Harvard's president about the inferior abilities of women in math and science, being white and/or a woman would appear less disparaging than being black and/or Latino [14].

Prestigious institutions, similar to the Ivy League, suggest the existence of a pattern. Among the largest public institutions, women and people of color face similar obstacles in becoming members of the faculty. According to data provided by the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), at Michigan State University [15], at a select number of institutions, women—that is, white women—are at no less of an advantage as prospective faculty than their Ivy League counterparts. Hence, it is plausible that discrimination as a norm in the hiring of academic personnel is arguably a reaction to the historical rigidity of various doctrines from which an equally rigid set of racist intellectual traditions had been derived—perpetuated on the basis of race/skin color. The motive is to enable a facade of fairness and equal opportunity for all victim-group populations. In fact, by definition, discrimination in faculty hiring is the recapitulation of a narcissistic exaggeration of what is white, that is, white supremacy [16]. In general, it may be said that discrimination was initially advanced to facilitate the radical standardization of conventional thinking not irrelevant to the white domination of academe. Liberating the academy from the dogmas of white domination did little more than

modernize racial/skin color discrimination to such an extent as to accommodate victim-group oppression of other victim groups by victim-group (white) women. Under the cloak of equality, victim-group discrimination replaced overt racial discrimination in faculty hiring as a more temperate but ultimately no less effective means of sustaining white supremacy. Such discrimination is manifested in the statistical data contained in Tables 10.1, 10.2, and 10.3. These tables dramatically illustrate differentiations between white women who were hired as faculty at prestigious institutions of higher education versus their black and/or nonwhite counterparts. Such disparities exist despite publicized rhetoric to recruit, tenure, and/or maintain black scholars as a means to diversify a traditionally white institution in a white-dominated, postcolonial society.

Table 10.1 Public institutions: Full-time female faculty, Fall 1995

Public institutions	Percentage of female
University of Oregon	36.3
Rutgers	31.4
University of Pittsburgh	30.8
UCLA	30.3
University of Colorado	30.0
University of North Carolina	29.9
Ohio State University	29.9
University of Washington	29.4
Indiana University	29.3
University of Missouri	28.9
University of California, Berkeley	28.8
University of Texas	28.6
University of Arizona	28.0
University of Maryland	27.1
State University of New York, Buffalo	26.7
University of Michigan	26.2
University of California, Santa Barbara	26.1
University of Nebraska	26.1
University of Florida	25.7
University of Illinois	25.5
Pennsylvania State University	25.3
Iowa State University	25.0
University of Iowa	24.8
University of Virginia	24.2
University of California, San Diego	24.1
University of Minnesota	23.8
University of Wisconsin	23.7
Purdue University	20.4
Average of percentiles	27.3

According to the data in the following tables Table 10.1 [15], among prestigious public institutions of higher education in the United States, of all full-time faculty, in Fall of 1995, the average percentile for women was 27.3%. The average percentile in Table 10.2 [15] for nonwhites including African-Americans, in Fall of 1995, was

Table 10.2 Public institutions: Full-time nonwhite faculty, Fall 1995

Public institutions	Percentage of nonwhite
University of California, Los Angeles	23.4
University of California, Berkeley	19.4
University of California, San Diego	19.3
University of California, Santa Barbara	18.3
State University of New York, Buffalo	17.0
University of Maryland	14.5
University of Pittsburgh	13.6
Rutgers	13.5
University of Michigan	13.5
University of Florida	13.0
University of Illinois	12.3
University of Colorado	12.1
University of Missouri	11.9
University of Texas	11.4
University of Arizona	11.2
Purdue University	11.2
University of Iowa	10.9
Ohio State University	10.9
University of Washington	10.2
Pennsylvania State University	10.1
University of North Carolina	9.9
Indiana University	9.5
University of Virginia	9.1
University of Wisconsin	9.1
Iowa State University	9.0
University of Oregon	8.4
University of Nebraska	8.0
University of Minnesota	7.5
Average of percentiles	12.4

12.4%. In Table 10.3 [15] is the most recent data, which illustrates by average of percentiles among full-time faculty at prestigious public institutions in 2003—31.3% for women and 15.1% for nonwhites.

While the above data cannot be construed as being racist or the direct result of white women's victim-group discrimination, the data are a product of racist impediments to sustaining a viable quality of life for nonwhite populations. As institutions, academia is reduced by the objective discourse of knowledge, accommodating the standardization of white ideals. The token assertions of white women who do not object, but profess to abhor racism, then pose the question of just what actions extend from their abhorrence when considering victim-group discrimination. Passivity to racial injustice is no less racist in its outcome than active participation. Thus, despite the emergence of white women in academia, the sexist notion of sexual promiscuity on the part of black women assumed the force of fact in American culture. This cultural debasement of black women, absent significant

Table 10.3 Public institutions: Full-time faculty 2003

Public institutions	Percentage of women	Percentage of nonwhite
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor	33	18
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign	31	18
Ohio State University, Main Campus	29	14
University of Wisconsin, Madison	28	13
Purdue University, Main Campus	26	13
Pennsylvania State University, Main Campus	32	13
Indiana University, Bloomington	34	13
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities	28	12
University of Iowa	31	11
University of California, Irvine	31	28
UCLA	28	25
University of California, San Diego	27	19
SUNY, Buffalo	29	19
University of California, Davis	29	19
University of Florida	31	18
SUNY, Stony Brook	31	18
University of California, Berkeley	29	17
University of California, Santa Barbara	30	17
University of Maryland, College Park	35	16
University of Pittsburgh, Main Campus	38	16
Rutgers	34	16
University of Texas, Austin	34	14
Texas A & M University	24	14
University of Arizona	34	14
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	37	13
University of Washington, Seattle Campus	35	13
Iowa State University	29	13
University of Missouri, Columbia	33	13
University of Kansas, Main Campus	32	13
University of Nebraska, Lincoln	30	10
University of Colorado, Boulder	33	10
University of Virginia, Main Campus	29	10
University of Oregon	42	9
Average of percentiles	31.3	15.1

objection from white women activists, is a dramatic demonstration of victim-group discrimination. Under the circumstances, the issues of nonwhite women are regarded as less than relevant to women's rights as a whole [17]. The assumed promiscuity of black women, in the minds of antebellum white women, thus justified their being raped, as true feminists would have otherwise objected. In the modern era, white women have been only slightly less apathetic to the injustices that racism has visited upon nonwhite, victim-group populations, exemplified by the challenges in academia directed solely at nonwhite faculty relative to grade inflation [18]. Tolerance for biased student evaluations of nonwhite faculty is a form of victim-group discrimination, which facilitates group failure and ultimately diminished quality of life.

During the promotion of one of his books, Derrick A. Bell—now Visiting Professor of Law at New York University School of Law—paused to comment on the ease with which white students complain to black professors. He reiterated that while substituting for a white colleague at the Harvard Law School, white students spent 10 minutes of class time complaining about the performance of their absent white professor. It occurred to Bell that, when the professor is a black or victim-group member, students are more likely to complain, whether such complaints are relevant to the class or not. They must feel that it is their right as entitlement dysfunction to challenge black credentials, correct black scholars in their fields of expertise, and to complain about black professors to department chairpersons. The fact of their differential treatment vis-à-vis black and white professors is no doubt racist. The predisposition of white students, at predominantly white universities in particular, assumes a negative impact on the academic careers of black faculty members. Yet differential treatment of black professors at white universities, though career threatening, is nonexistent among the ideological priorities of whites and/or women who dominate academia. Furthermore, while publications are usually the mainstay of faculty retention and tenure evaluations, university political or financial issues may exacerbate the importance of nonscientific student evaluations. White university committees, in assessing their professors, require additional evidence to substantiate the competence of black professors. Their efforts may be rendered culpable by the application of time-efficient numerical summaries, such as ratings in 1–8 categories. Such summaries take precedent over students written comments. And, rarely if ever, will those committees acknowledge the empirical data that substantiate the fact that white students apply a harsher standard for assessing black professors than to their white counterparts. Ultimately, black women may suffer the harshest assessment of all—to the apathy of their feminist white sisters as victim-group discrimination [19].

It is such a response to the oppression of victim-group populations that frees white women from ascriptions of any responsibility. It has evolved and would appear to have become a cultural tradition. More devastating is the idea of equality, implicit in the feminist demand that women be given power and control over their bodies [20]. Like all feminist demands for power and control, the idea of equality is directed at forces thought to prevent white women from gaining equality. Black women remain tainted by accusations of promiscuity and academic incompetence because, under a racist system, white women cannot avail themselves to a struggle that does not involve and/or benefit them personally. Thus, similar to white gay and lesbian Americans, they have sought to frame women's issues in a context subject to the control and domination of white women only.

Among feminists, manifestations of victim-group discrimination are a direct result of historical domination by white men, which has encouraged the subjugation of black women and people by white women. Regarding race and skin color, the uppermost in status became those of European descent [21]. Under the guise of eliminating sexism, white women contributed to it. Their efforts necessitated values, which are in many ways not only racist but were discriminatory [22]. The result is a configuration of victim-group discrimination whereby women's issues become a matter of dominant-group, white female interpretation. Under the circumstances,

other victim-group populations and their issues are relegated to second-class status by white women and/or the fringes of the women's movement and overall equal rights sustaining the ultimate white privilege.

Regarding white privilege, white feminists may say they are against racism and discrimination when what they really mean is individual racism [23]. They refuse to recognize that whites, including victim-group white women, benefit as a group from institutional and systemic racism against other victim groups, including people of color. Thus, all white women are the nepotistic beneficiaries of a racist system that bestows inherited privileges. For white feminists to admit their association with racism would render it impossible for them to deny shared responsibility in the subjugation of and hence victim-group discrimination against nonwhite women and other people of color. They have thus elected themselves as the architects of women's rights, and who effectively define and direct the objectives of feminist ideology.

According to white women, feminism should meet four conditions: (a) Feminism should be acceptable to those who call themselves feminists and consistent with the understanding of feminism held by sympathetic outsiders; (b) feminism should construe feminism, which presents itself as a critique of some of the broadest features of society, as comprehensive and systematic; (c) feminism should construe feminism as more than a platitude, which no reasonable person would dispute but which has no practical consequences; and (d) feminism should construe feminism as a view that is taken seriously by a significant number of people. Who those people are is assumed without direct reference to be white. Who is credited with the authorship of such conditions is grist for debate, but arguably racist in its evolution within a racist system of subjugation [24]. Similar to white gay and lesbian Americans who have trivialized the nonwhite members of their community, white women have done likewise to women of color, however unintended.

Extended from the conditions of feminism is thus a familiar theme in writing as if the struggles of nonwhite women (and men) are insignificant by comparison. It suggests the world would be a better place if women were leaders because women are less belligerent than men are [25]. Whatever the other merits, this idea would seem to involve a strong commitment to innate sex differences and less to race and skin color issues. The theme is rendered moot, however, given the fact that a critical point is left unclear: Is the lesser belligerence of women innate or is it the product of socialization? This concept is as contradictory as an oxymoron. If women's lesser belligerence is innate, how are they to reach positions of leadership whose attainment requires competitiveness? If women's lesser belligerence is learned, how did sexism result in moral superiority? And if sexism can produce moral superiority, the application of women's lesser belligerence to bring about peace will perpetuate the oppression that produced it—a notion diametrically opposed to women's rights.

The foregoing principles would have otherwise been dismissed as sexist, had they not been endorsed by white women. That is not to imply that substantial differences do not exist between men and women. No doubt, differences arise in a social context where elements of socialization and power combine with women's

reproductive ability. However, such differences would be less confining if white women—in particular—had been reared to sympathize with the black and/or non-white cultural experience. But in a racist system that differentiates by skin color, there is no distinctive voice for the mainstream espousing of nonwhite factions. Thus, the work of nonwhite scholars, such as Pierce and Du Bois, is all but unknown to white scholars in the academy. Sex differences then dominate feminist ideology and are usually a priority beyond all other forms of discrimination and oppression. Thus, the conspicuous absence of racism and victim-group discrimination from the discourse of white feminist ideology minimizes its existence to the point that white women themselves are the lone beneficiaries of its perpetuation [26]. Under the circumstances, nothing short of the redistribution of power will sustain the ability of nonwhite victim groups to be heard. Such a complex manifestation of victim-group discrimination is a subtle but no less formidable form of what McIntosh [26] refers to as white privilege.

As with victim-group discrimination, white women appear less than willing to address the existence of white privilege while at the same time granting that black women and other victim-group populations are acutely disadvantaged. They profess efforts to gain women's rights that focus on society's most prestigious and powerful institutions, including academia, stopping short of any effort that would limit white privilege. Such efforts are unspeakable in polite circles and buffer the privileges of white women from legitimate discussion.

Because racism is endemic to the institutions of America, including academia, victim-group discrimination by white women prevails [27]. The polite façade and moral pretense of feminists destine white privilege to a longevity rivaled only by the racism from which it emerged. Thus, white women who dare acknowledge white privilege prefer to do so in the context of some remote abstraction. They are instructed by cultural experience to ignore white privilege, much as males in a patriarchy are taught to ignore the advantages of gender. Their inability to confront their unfair advantage predisposes them to a painful reality. Germane to that reality is an illusive cask of inherited assets that gives them daily advantage as white women over all nonwhite populations, regardless of gender roles [28]. As a result, they necessarily perceive women's issues via contrasting priorities with black and other women of color. This presents a formidable obstacle to nonwhite women who have challenged the most insidious forms of victim-group discrimination by white women, based on skin color. White males have not been irrelevant to that obstacle as members of the power structure. However, extended from that discrimination, the ideals of feminine beauty in America remain a tradition of light skin and other white features. Given the prestige of America at home and abroad as enabled by media technology, nonwhite women have contributed to their own victimization by aspiring to white beauty standards. In an attempt to effect white ideals, nonwhite women have risked their health and self-esteem without objections from their white counterparts who, by their apathy, have contributed to the homogeny of blond, light-skinned advertising images as the standardized ideal of feminine beauty—personified by the Breck Girl.

For women of color, American standards of feminine ideals define beauty in a white, Eurocentric context. Subsequently, all other than a Eurocentric phenotype have become less than ideal, hence “ugly.” Following WWII and the colonial liberation of Asia and Africa, the worldview consciousness of non-European people changed dramatically [29]. This impacted accepted traditions of whiteness that had been heretofore unchallenged. In the aftermath, Eurocentric traditions as the ideal standard of feminine beauty have been subjected to persistent challenges from women of color [30]. Those challenges are no doubt fundamentally justified in the necessary evolution of society in an effort to reduce victim-group and other forms of discrimination. The script is that women of color must challenge established traditions, which by their very nature have denigrated all but Eurocentric phenotypes, that is, European skin color [31].

The modern ideal of feminine beauty is a postcolonial tradition that has dominated American awareness [32]. This otherwise obvious assumption has not been challenged. Standards of beauty are no doubt a recapitulation of the colonial world order, which has been sustained by a Western geopolitical tradition since the era of Europe’s global imperialism. What is more, as part of a geopolitical tradition, American standards of beauty originated largely in the context of the Western experience. Thus, until recently, all mainstream representations of feminine beauty originated in France, Great Britain, Germany, Italy, and the United States. Furthermore, despite the academic trek toward diversity, feminine beauty remains a bastion of Eurocentric operatives who by way of advanced media technology have come to dominate beauty-industry images [33]. Thus, ideal standards of beauty evolved in correlation to Eurocentric norms, Eurocentric preferences, and Eurocentric skin color, that is, white beauty standards. Hence, it was virtually inevitable that women of color in the United States and elsewhere would idealize the Eurocentric standard of feminine beauty in their desire to emulate the celebrated attributes of the Breck Girl.

Western fantasies of idealized feminine beauty are relevant to the light-skinned Breck Girl, regarding women of color. About 1930, Edward Breck, a white businessman, inherited a Massachusetts shampoo company, started by his father [33]. In his first order of business, he contracted Charles Sheldon, a commercial artist, to design an advertising image for the Breck products. Sheldon represented the “Breck Girls” as “provocative, even sensual, female poses executed in pastels, with soft focus and haloes of light and color to create highly romantic images of feminine beauty and purity” [33]. Sheldon was succeeded by a Ralph Williams, who depicted what he envisioned as perfect feminine beauty, which has been sustained over numerous decades: white women who were characterized by blue eyes, blond hair, and skin that was so light as to appear like alabaster. All three traits are noted by the absence of color. Light skin, having the most dramatic impact, became the Western standard of how the ideal in feminine beauty should appear. For any woman not born with such traits, products could be obtained to bleach the hair and skin so that even the darkest of women of color could attain some approximation to the idealized traits of the light-skinned Breck Girl. The phenomenon lives on today in the sale

of cosmetic contact lenses and bleach creams to produce Caucasian blue eyes and white-like light skin.

To Western males, the Breck Girl represented the ultimate ideal of feminine beauty. The artists who created the image found their inspiration in the person of a young woman, Roma Whitney [33]. She was selected in 1937, at the youthful age of 17, and was considered such an example of perfect feminine beauty that her portrait was chosen, in 1946, by the Breck company to help launch their first national advertising campaign. By 1951, her face became the registered trademark for Breck company products. Men gazed at her blonde mane and light skin while the women of her day looked on. No one ever considered the devastating affects her image might have had upon the self-esteem of women of color. The Breck Girl, as idealized standard of feminine beauty, did not produce a Western male counterpart although women had ideas of what attractive men looked like. The Breck Girl was more likely the fantasy of the dominant white-male power structure. There will always be debate as to how certain specific ideals came about, but that they exist in the ideal of light skin is verified by empirical data collected from women of color.

Among contemporary women of color, significant empirical evidence exists regarding the role of light skin and perceptions of idealized feminine beauty: Skin color is a significant but seldom publicized aspect of societal tradition, because it is not polite. Using a sample of college students enrolled at a women’s institution of higher education, I developed the following null hypothesis, formulated to provide a context for investigating this problem: “There is no relationship between skin color and selected values for skin color ideals.” My testing sample consisted of 117 participants, during the traditional school year. Respondents had a mean age of 20 years. The Cutaneo-Chroma Correlate (CCC), a self-reporting instrument, was administered for assessing skin color. The CCC was developed and previously pilot tested by myself to determine the relationship between skin color and various aspects of bias relative to sections “A,” “B,” and “C.” Section B (of the CCC) was used to appraise the respondent’s personal values pertaining to skin color [34]. In differentiating responses, a designation of lightest was noted as (a) 5, (b) light as 4, (c) medium as 3, (d) dark as 2, and (e) darkest as 1. The results are contained in Tables 10.4, and 10.5 below.

Table 10.4 Pretty Skin

Pretty skin is:	Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
5 Lightest	14	12.0	12.2	12.2
4 Light	75	64.1	65.2	77.4
3 Medium	22	18.8	19.1	96.5
2 Dark	3	2.6	2.6	99.1
1 Darkest	1	0.9	0.9	100.0
Total	115	98.3	100.0	
Missing system	2	1.7		
Total	117	100.0	100.0	

Table 10.5 Pretty Women

The skin color of pretty women is:	Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
1 Lightest	11	9.4	9.5	9.5
2 Light	79	67.5	68.1	77.6
3 Medium	24	20.5	20.7	98.3
4 Dark	1	0.9	0.9	99.1
5 Darkest	1	0.9	0.9	100.0
Total	116	99.1	100.0	
Missing system	1	0.9		
Total	117	100.0	100.0	

In Table 10.4, most students (76.1%) responded “lightest” or “light” when questioned about pretty skin. Only 3.5% responded “dark” or “darkest.” 18.8% of student participants responded “medium” to pretty skin. Interestingly, less than 1% thought of “darkest” skin as pretty.

In Table 10.5, most students (76.9%) responded “lightest” or “light” when questioned about the skin color of pretty women. Only 1.8% responded “dark” or “darkest.” 20.5% responded “medium” regarding the skin color of pretty women. Using this data, it would appear with some reservation that light skin is in fact a prerequisite of ideal feminine beauty among the women of color, as a whole. Hence, per empirical data, it is plausible to reject the null hypothesis: “There is no relationship between skin color and selected values for skin color ideals” and accept an alternative hypothesis: “There is a relationship between skin color and selected values for skin color ideals.”

The standardization of light skin as ideal of feminine beauty is a post-Breck Girl phenomenon, tacitly endorsed by feminists in victim-group discrimination. It is the cause of both psychological and physiological pathologies among nonwhite women in America and other parts of the world, formulated by myself [35] as the Bleaching Syndrome. The Bleaching Syndrome is apparent among women of color who apply toxic concoctions to their skin to affect alien ideals of feminine beauty.

A Canadian woman of color, 16-year-old Grace, is a student who is depressed by what she sees when looking at herself in the mirror. She does not like her kinky-permed-straight African hair in a world where almost all hair is straight. Her nose is broad and her lips are thick in a world where noses are fine and lips are thin. Her dark brown eyes suggest to her that she is ugly. She sees no option except applying bleaching creams to her skin. Each time she resorts to using bleaching creams is an opportunity to escape her self-perceived ugliness; with each application, she can get closer to idealized, light-skinned Western beauty. When the effect wears off, Grace is forced to acknowledge the fact that she is black. She feels that she is undesirable to men and, only by bleaching her skin, can she be rescued. She believes a failure to bleach will sentence her to a life of horror and shame in her dark skin.

Another woman of color, 17-year-old Jamaican Latoya, is determined to bleach her skin, which the locals call “brownin,” a Jamaican term used in reference to

light-skinned blacks. Latoya applies thick layers of bleaching creams to her face, despite the threat that some may contain dangerous steroids. She is aware of warning labels that bleaching could damage her skin. She does daily bleaching because she is pleased with the outcome. "When I walk on the streets you can hear people say, 'Hey, check out the brownin'. It is cool. It looks pretty. . . . When you are lighter, people pay more attention to you. It makes you more important" [36].

Selina Margaret Oppong, a 50-year-old African woman, started bleaching her skin "with the aim to brighten up the skin." Her counterpart hairstylist, Maama Adwoa, is against the idea of bleaching as a practice for beautifying ugly dark African skin. She contends that fading, as it is called, does little good. African women fade "because they think they might look beautiful." Another woman, Cecilia Animahh is inclined to be even more frank: "In Ghana," according to her, "some of the men want bleaching girls." That being so, it appears that getting a light skin that glows is all but impossible for naturally dark-skinned African women. Diana Gyaamfua, age 28, says, "I started bleaching two years ago, but stopped because I started developing very bad stretch marks." Added to the incidence of stretch marks is the fact that those who bleach their skin usually eventually begin to look like they have been sunburned. Their faces develop a brick red and puffy look associated with black, grotesque-looking splotches.

"The commonest complication of bleaching that we see is post-inflammatory hyper-pigmentation of the skin, especially at the areas around the eyes," according to dermatologist Prosper Doe, who is employed by Komfo Anokye Teaching Hospital, in Kumasi, Ghana. Those who bleach begin by wanting to have lighter, smoother skin, but the end result is darker and blotchy skin. "If people look redder or have a stranger color, which in their eyes looks lighter than ours, they feel happier," says tour guide Alloeei-Cofie. African newspapers document a growing tendency among local Africans who prefer light skin and to bleach. Those, who cannot afford to bleach, find a way, including wives of public officials to those of local street vendors. They are the middle class as well as the poor. African women who bleach are the least concerned about money when they have a chance to become beautiful. Knowing the risks, many African women ignore that bleaching is a practice that in the end will cost them more than money. Thus, "I can't go out in the sun because the sun is too hot," exclaims Animahh.

To get the same effects as bleaching, some women will use steroids on their skin. Dr. Naureen Zaheer describes this as being a lethal combination. "They have a very bad effect on the skin and make it thinner and more prone to disorders. It can cause acne, and could also have the reverse effect and turn the skin black. . . . The tissue becomes very delicate and can be damaged even if it is scratched." The two harsh ingredients contained in bleaching creams used in this area of the world are ammonia and hydrogen peroxide. Use of ammonia can result in skin irritation and, according to skin specialists, it is this that is the cause of most problems. Such irritation can cause the skin to show redness. Should the redness progress it can blister and eventually burn. "The burn is usually superficial, but it can go deeper if you leave the cream on for too long," according to Zaheer, who then cited the case of a patient whose skin was ulcerated and prone to eczema. The result was facial

skin being covered in marks and black spots. "There have been patients whom I have referred to the plastic surgery department because the burns are so bad," said Zaheer. When questioned as to what advice she would give women to discourage them from bleaching, she answered: "We know that women will use these creams regardless of the advice we give them. But what we do say is that they should not use them when consuming other medication" [37].

Hydroquinone, a chemical found in many current skin bleaching products, was initially used by African-Americans, who discovered that its use would lighten their skin. The skin-lightening effect is made possible by the chemical's ability to compromise the body's manufacture of melanin—the skin color element. When using hydroquinone, dark skin fades during the normal aging process and is replaced by bleached cells. A number of scientists believe that the chemical is a carcinogen or cancer agent. It is so harsh that it is used in photography as a developing agent. Companies that manufacture skin bleaching products insist hydroquinone is harmless. However, in 1995, New York Commissioner of Consumer Affairs Mark Green requested that the chemical be banned.

No less susceptible to the Bleaching Syndrome, African-Americans take note of the implications of light skin in all matters. They understand the vilification of dark skin has enabled the victimization of many as racist stereotypes. Those women who cannot meet required skin color ideals suffer the consequences [38]. Thus, women of African descent, compared to women of European descent, are victimized and oppressed more often than any other racial, ethnic, gender, or social/culture group [39]. Given the power of media to impose and monitor ideals, such victimization may keep women, who are otherwise physically and psychologically healthy, under constant emotional and psychological stress indicative of the Bleaching Syndrome. Human service professionals, including social workers, have suggested by their apathy to the problem that the health and well-being of nonwhite women is less important.

Regarding victim-group discrimination, social work is a profession dominated by white women. Similar to the attempts of white gays and lesbians to trivialize issues that are significant to gays and lesbians of color, white women who engage in victim-group discrimination against women of color have all but totally ignored the Bleaching Syndrome in the social work literature. A cursory review of that literature attests to little inclusion of issues pertaining to skin color, notwithstanding its life-threatening salience among women of color. According to the *Social Work Abstracts* database [40], in the quarter century from 1977 to 2001, only 12 peer-reviewed journal articles were published on skin color. In leading journals such as the *Social Service Review* and *Social Work*, skin color has been totally ignored in this time period, accommodating its trivialization. Social work journals such as *Affilia* and *Arete*, specifically dedicated to issues concerning women and professing feminist philosophy, have neglected skin color. In leading textbooks such as *Human Behavior in the Social Environment* by Zastrow and Kirst-Ashman [41], the issue of skin color pertaining to people of color is omitted from the index and the 300 plus pages of text that comprise the topic of skin color issues. The fact that both authors are of European descent and that one is a white woman cannot be dismissed

as irrelevant to their Eurocentric perspective, being victim-group discrimination. While they may be cognizant of the critical issues pertaining to women of color, as authors it is they who determine the priority of what is published. The knowledge disseminated concerning women of color then determines the direction and accuracy of the social work knowledge base, dominated by white women. What is omitted otherwise ceases to exist. Given life-threatening skin diseases and assaults upon self-esteem, the omission of white beauty standards from social work literature and the pathological impact upon women of color is tantamount to the most blatant distortions of knowledge—hence, it is victim-group discrimination.

Social work authors who attempt to convey the significance of skin color have encountered resistance from the peer-review process, in its openness to new and/or nonwhite ideas. Counter to what they are believed to be is the fact that white women as peer reviewers will cooperate in the control and limitation of new theories, ideas, and unexpected observations particularly pertaining to people of color [42]. Ironically, the most potent source of that resistance extends from the very individuals whose precise mission is to sustain the merits and quality of social work knowledge: authors and editors of books and referees of scholarly journals, many of whom are white female victims of male oppression.

With few exceptions, all journals, including those of social work, assess the worth and potential of submitted papers. However, white women control those that address the issues of women of color. Their subjugation of the Bleaching Syndrome, despite that it may threaten the lives of women of color, is a dramatic manifestation of victim-group discrimination that must necessarily terminate to accommodate the prestige of academia.

The inability of white women to acknowledge the pathology of skin color, relative to standardized white ideals of feminine beauty, suggests their discrimination does not rise to a conscious level. Nonwhite women are astutely aware of the racism and victim-group discrimination attributable to white women and white privilege. The result is an intellectual chasm that has rendered feminism all but totally irrelevant to the interests and issues confronting women of color. Extended from the denial of white privilege and apathy for the impact of white beauty standards upon women of color among feminists is thus ignorance of oppression and their role in the larger super-culture. Morality is measured by individual effort, which allows white women to sustain their integrity despite their oppressing black and other women of color.

As members of a “values” profession, dominated by white women, social workers must be held to a higher standard of moral excellence. A multitude of lists proliferated from that assertion. One of the most widely accepted of such lists is Biestek’s Principles [43], of the casework relationship between professional worker and client. While several values are listed, “individualization” and “self-determination” are most relevant to the plight of women of color, in overcoming victim-group discrimination and gaining a voice in the women’s movement and other relevant white institutional venues such as academia.

Regarding individualization, women of color are unique and deserve to be treated as such. They have dignity and self-worth pertinent to individual merits. By virtue

of victim-group discrimination, feminism has not accommodated the individualization of women of color in their efforts to sustain themselves. Being so, their self-determination is rendered all but virtually impossible.

Self-determination is a most difficult goal to accomplish. As an extension of individualization, self-determination gives women of color the license to have their issues incorporated into the mainstream of women's rights. The fact that it has not been forthcoming lends credibility to the assertion of racist influences. Among white social workers, failure to purge white standards from the social work ethos is made apparent by the inauguration among nonwhite women of "womanism," also in response to victimism.

Self-definition is the anchor of empowerment for women of color. Increasing awareness of self-worth will help sustain them in the midst of victim-group discrimination perpetrated against them by white women. By any other nomenclature, womanism is its antidote. Unlike feminism, womanism is not an abstract, transcendental, race-bound, male-hate concept. Its cultural and spiritual relativism is invigorating. It emerges from the same Afrocentric culturisms that have sustained black and other people of color through the antebellum, persecution, and other discrimination. It will enable women of color to retrieve their dignity when compromised by white racism. It thus transcends alien and/or irrelevant conceptions and perceptions of nonwhite women. The chasm between women of color, as ugly and objects of promiscuity on the one hand, and white feminists, self-elected to interpret, negotiate, and direct gender policies on the other, has been accounted for [44].

Womanism is a response to victim-group discrimination enabled by white feminism; this is a newly emerging ideology that allows for the voices of nonwhite women as a whole to be heard [45]. Many have moved with deliberate speed and caution in support of womanism as a valid ideology. To them it presupposes the inauguration of their empowerment. Their empowerment represents the totality of their feminine beauty and self-expression. Black author Alice Walker articulated it best, describing it as an aspect of "African Americans' appreciation of mature womanhood in a girl" [46]. Another black woman, Chikwenye Okonjo, similarly defined womanism as a "consciousness that transcends individual awareness and is not new to African women" [46]. The efforts of both women contributed to the foundation and growth of awareness that would necessitate an independent voice—apart from feminism, which is too often dominated by white interests. Thus, according to Professor Madhu Dubey, "The term womanism, coined by [Alice] Walker, may be interpreted as an attempt to integrate black nationalism into feminism, to articulate a distinctively black feminism that shares some of the objectives of black nationalist ideology" [46]. Womanism is distinctly different from feminism in that it is grounded in a classless, genderless, folk culture committed to the sustenance of nonwhite people as a whole. It is thus a global ideology that celebrates nonwhite heritage without minimizing the worth of womanhood. It concerns itself as much with sexual liberation and gender equality as it does with a racist white super-culture that subjugates nonwhite people by means of victim-group discrimination and other racist forms of domination.

The eventuality of womanism is compulsory to the empowerment of all non-European women. But the darker-skinned black woman, in particular, does not exist in some pristine middle-class environment devoid of social problems, save for gender discrimination. She is cognizant of the fact that those who would oppress women of color make no distinctions as to the oppression of black people in general [47]. She is a force to be reckoned with on the farm and in the market place. Her issues, though less visible to the white super-culture, are rapidly gaining notice. It is reflected in the new crop of female, black writers who have commenced celebrating their emerging empowerment by way of more positive roles/images [48].

Womanism serves as a homeostatic force between spirituality and cultural reality without compromising group values and individualism. It encourages nonwhite women's mutual support without negating the larger struggle of others, including the dispossessed, alienated, exploited, and otherwise oppressed folk. It values family, matrimony, and motherhood [49]. It does not envision empowerment through hatred of men, of other races, or white feminists. It is contingent upon a need for self-definition within a historical, geopolitical, and cultural context. Its divorce from white feminism assures a voice and the empowerment of nonwhite women worldwide in the eventual total elimination of victim-group discrimination.

References

1. Blee, K. (1991). *Women of the Klan: racism and gender in the 1920s*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
2. Newman, L. (1999). *White women's rights: the racial origins of feminism in the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press.
3. Hodes, M. (1997). *White women, black men*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
4. Soule, S. (1992). Populism and black lynching in Georgia, 1890–1900. *Social Forces*, 71(2), 431–449.
5. Phillips, C. (1987). Exploring relations among forms of social control: the lynching and execution of blacks in North Carolina, 1889–1918. *Law and Society Review*, 21(3), 361–374.
6. Potocky, M., & Rodgers, F. (1998). Social work research with minority and oppressed populations: methodological issues and innovations. *Journal of Social Service Research*, entire issue, 23(3/4), xiii–xiv.
7. Staples, R. (1976). *Introduction to black sociology*. New York: McGraw Hill.
8. Du Bois, W. (1976). *The Philadelphia Negro: a social study*. New York: Schocken Books.
9. Davis, A. (1973). *American heroine: the life and legend of Jane Addams*. New York: Oxford University Press.
10. Du Bois, W. (1961). *The souls of black folk*. Greenwich, CT: Fawcett.
11. Lundblad, K. (1995). Jane Addams and social reform: a role model for the 1990s. *Social Work*, 40(5), 661–669.
12. Hall, R. (2003). Eurocentric bias in women's psychology journals: resistance to issues significant to people of color. *European Psychologist*, 8(2), 117–122.
13. Arenson, K. (2005, March 1). Little advance is seen at ivies in the hiring of minorities and women. *New York Times*. <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9B0DE3DA123DF932A35750C0A9639C8B63>. Accessed 26 June 2009.
14. Luecek, T. (2005, February 13). 3 presidents criticize Harvard chief's comments. *New York Times*, A35, col. 5. 4

15. Michigan State University. (2003). *Integrated postsecondary Education Data System*. Office of Institutional Research [now Office of Planning and Budgets], Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan. <http://opbweb.msu.edu/>. Accessed 26 June 2009.
16. Riley, A. (1996). Murder and social work. *Australian Social Work*, 49(2), 37–43.
17. Jordan, E. (1994). Sleeping with the enemy: sex, black women and the civil war. *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 18(2), 55–63.
18. Leuba, R. (1974). Individualized instruction and the letter grade system. National Conference on Behavior Research and Technology in Higher Education, Atlanta, Georgia, November 14–16.
19. Daufin, E. (1995, March 9). Confessions of a womanist professor. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 12(1), 34–35.
20. Gronlund, N., & Linn, R. (1990). *Measurement and evaluation in teaching* (6th ed.). New York: Macmillan.
21. Paglia, C. (1992). *Sex, art, and American culture*. New York: Vintage.
22. Barak, A., Pitterman, Y., & Yitzhadi, R. (1995). An empirical test of the role of power differential in originating sexual harassment. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 17(4), 497–517.
23. Van Ausdale, D. (1997). Portraits of white racism. *Journal of American Ethnic History*, 16(2), 64–68.
24. Soule, S. (1992). Populism and black lynching in Georgia. *Social Forces*, 71(2), 431–449.
25. Levin, M. (1987). *Feminism and freedom*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
26. McIntosh, P. (1989, July/August). White privilege: unpacking the invisible knapsack. *Peace and Freedom*, 2, 10–12.
27. Kilty, K., & Swank, E. (1997). Institutional racism and the media: depictions of violent criminals and welfare recipients. *Sociological Imagination*, 34(2–3), 105–128.
28. Makkar, J., & Strube, M. (1995). Black women's self perception of attractiveness following exposure to white versus black beauty standards: the moderating role of racial identity and self esteem. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 25(17), 1547–1566.
29. Barik, B., Katare, P., & Seth, S. (2001). National seminar on rural development and human rights violation in western India. *Indian Journal of Social Work*, 62(2), 249–257.
30. Kebede, M. (2001). The rehabilitation of violence and the violence of rehabilitation: fanon and colonialism. *Journal of Black Studies*, 31(5), 539–562.
31. Cox, E. (2001). Community practice issues in the 21st century: questions and challenges for power-oriented practitioners. *Journal of Community Practice*, 9(1), 37–55.
32. Monteiro, A. (2000). Being an African in the world: the Du Boisian epistemology. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, 568, 220–234.
33. Minnick, M. (2000, January). Breck girls. *Smithsonian*, 30(10), 96.
34. Hall, R. (2000). A descriptive analysis of skin color psychopathology in Puerto Rico: ecological applications to practice. *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*, 27(4), 171–183.
35. Hall, R. (2006). The bleaching syndrome among people of color: implications of skin color for human behavior in the social environment. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 13(3), 19–31.
36. Obaahemaa Network (2002). Effects of skin bleaching. <http://www.obaahemaa.net/Channels/feature/edit.cfm>. Accessed 26 June 2009.
37. Chisholm, N.J. (2002). Fade to white: skin bleaching and the rejection of blackness. *Village Voice* January: 22–28. Available at <http://www.villagevoice.com/2002-01-22/news/fade-to-white/>. Accessed 26 June 2009.
38. Opala, K. (2001, May 30). Cosmetics ban: did standards body err? *Nation* (Nairobi). <http://allafrica.com/stories/200105290458.html>. Accessed 12 April 2009.
39. Hall, R. E. (1992). Bias among African Americans regarding skin color: implications for social work practice. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 2, 479–486.
40. Social work abstracts. <http://www.columbia.edu/cgi-bin/cul/resolve?AMT0865>. Accessed 10 August 2009.

41. Zastrow, C., & Kirst-Ashman, K. (2001). *Understanding human behavior and the social environment*. (5th Ed.). Stamford, CT: Brooks/Cole.
42. Barber, B. (1961). Resistance by scientists to scientific discovery. *Science*, 134, 596–602.
43. Biestek, F. (1957). *The casework relationship*. Chicago: Loyola University Press.
44. Christensen, K. (1997). “With whom do you believe your lot is cast?”: white feminists and racism. *Signs*, 22(3), 617–648.
45. Mootry, M. (1994). Africana womanism: reclaiming ourselves. *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 18(4), 244–245.
46. Kolawole, M. (1997). *Womanism and African consciousness*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.
47. Ramey, F. (1995). Obstacles faced by African American women administrators in higher education: how they cope. *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 19(2), 113–119.
48. Harrison, F. (1993). Writing against the grain: cultural politics of difference in the work of Alice Walker. *Critique of Anthropology*, 13(4), 401–427.
49. Brown, E. (1989). Womanist consciousness: Maggie Lena Walker and the independent order of St. Luke. *Signs*, 14(3), 610–633.

Chapter 11

Immigrants: The Desire to Be White

America began and remains a nation of immigrants, where citizens of foreign countries leave their birthplace for a chance to realize the American Dream. Initially, most immigrants were from Europe. For them the American Dream represented an opportunity for religious freedom, where they might worship without fear of retribution from foreign governments or hostile dictatorships. This first wave of immigrants was white, by racial identity. After a single generation, once their children had acquired English language and American cultural skills, they were accepted as members of the bona fide American mainstream. In a short span of time, the American Dream had become a reality for them.

While Europeans continue to migrate to American shores, the second wave of immigrants began, characterized by those from Third World and Latin American countries—including Africa, Mexico, and the Caribbean region. With some exceptions, most are nonwhite and dark-skinned, by racial identity. They arrive having been subjected in their birth countries to the historical influences of Western colonization. For example, the white influences upon Third World and Latin American immigrants are apparent in the British colonization of Asians from India and Africans from Ghana or the Spanish colonization of South American nations, in addition to Puerto Rico and its Latino neighbor, Cuba. Identifiable as people of color, this second wave of immigrants is considered to be members of a minority group who, by Western colonization, are then predisposed to imperial Europe's colonial skin color hierarchy. Nevertheless, as people of color having been dominated by colonial Europeans, they are also members of a victim-group population. Their designation as nonwhite Americans necessitate that, as immigrants, they are both the victims of race and skin color discrimination and are simultaneously perpetrators in the discrimination they act out against other victim-group populations. That discrimination is widely directed at dark-skinned Americans, that is, African-Americans. Despite this historical social phenomenon in America that has been dominated by white immigrants, there remain citizens who go about their daily lives with hardly any notice at all of the discriminatory implications of skin color in the perpetration of victim-group discrimination. Furthermore, those who attend some of our most prestigious universities, which serve a substantial minority population, have not the faintest idea of how the implications of skin color extended from European colonization facilitate victim-group discrimination. Among this second

wave of immigrant victim-group populations from Latin America are Nicaraguans, whose colonial experience is typical and dramatically illustrated in its history.

Among Nicaraguans, victim-group discrimination has been all but ignored in the scholarly literature. In fact, discrimination among Nicaraguans is manifested on the basis of skin color, whereby those who are light-skinned presume the social and psychological demeanor of their colonizers. This enables a hierarchy that results in a form of discrimination directed particularly at persons of visible African descent. For these newly arrived immigrants of color to America, the outcome is critical to their ability to thrive within their own communities. Thus, to characterize discrimination via a narrow white supremacy model does a disservice to its pervasiveness. It results in the absurd rhetoric of discrimination, limited to white Americans and, in fact, provides a conduit for the continued social, economic, and political oppression of victim-group populations—whereby those characterized by dark skin are the focus of blatant forms of covert and overt oppression.

Many victim-group immigrants who were socialized under the historical rubric of colonization do, in fact, discriminate against darker-skinned people of their own racial groups. Their discrimination is a consequence of having emotionally and psychologically inculcated white and/or European norms. For South Americans, the social and economic impact of skin color is then increasingly potent [1]. The previously mentioned history of the dark-skinned Afro-Nicaraguans from Coastal Nicaragua is but one among any number of examples of victim-group discrimination. The fact that the original colonial African community largely saw itself as descendants of British civilization would have likely occurred among other groups under similar circumstances. They spoke English, while most Latinos today speak Spanish. They idealized Anglo-Saxon values and cultural practices, as most Latinos idealize Spain. They perceived themselves as they were defined—as British subjects—as the upper classes among Latinos note with pride any white, Spanish ancestry [1]. The continuing existence of victim-group discrimination in South America is apparent to visitors [1]. Many, like Miskitu, mestizos, and Garifuna—who share the same light skin trait—as well as a substantial number of Creoles—who do not share skin color similarities—are a testament to the social complexities of color [1].

Many studies have suggested that what existed in Nicaragua historically is typical for victim-group populations in South America and elsewhere. All are quite sensitive to issues involving skin color. Aware of racism once they reach the United States, light-skinned Puerto Rican immigrants may adamantly reject identification with darker-skinned people of color. Data collected in recent decades from Mexicans, Mexican Americans, Spanish-speaking Americans, and Euro-American immigrants have verified high rejection rates by these groups toward all African-Americans. That rejection is especially prominent among Mexican American immigrants from rural areas. The situation is exacerbated by the modern numbers of victim-group immigrants who seek citizenship in white countries, in contrast with white immigrants and in the countries in which they seek residence.

According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) [2], migration to white nations—including Germany, Netherlands, United

Kingdom, Australia, Canada, and the United States—accounts for a significant portion of the total immigrant populations, as seen in the following tables: Table 11.1 illustrates the percentage of foreigners in each of the stated countries in 1996; Table 11.2 illustrates the number of foreigners, by thousands, who sought asylum in 1996–1997; and Table 11.3 illustrates the percentage of people of color who migrated by selected countries in 1997.

Table 11.1 The percentage of foreigners in each country, 1996

Nation	Percentage of population
Germany	8.9
Netherlands	4.4
United Kingdom	3.4
Australia	21.1
Canada	17.4
United States	9.3

Table 11.2 The number of foreigners, by thousands, who sought asylum in 1996–1997 (1000s)

Nation	Asylum seekers, 1000s
Germany	104.4
Netherlands	34.4
United Kingdom	41.5
Australia	7.7
Canada	23.9
United States	79.8

Table 11.3 The percentage of people of color who immigrated, by selected countries, in 1997

Nation	Immigrants of color	Percent (%)
France	Morocco	12
	Turkey	06
	Algeria	14
Germany	Turkey	10
United Kingdom	India	06
United States	Philippines	06
	Mexico	18
	Dominican Republic	04

As seen in Tables 11.1, 11.2, and 11.3, Australia has the largest foreign-born population, at 21.1%, followed by Canada at 17.4%. Germany has the largest number of asylum seekers in the thousands at 104.4, followed by the United States at 79.8. France has the largest percentage of people of color who immigrated at 32%, followed by the United States at 28%.

The desire among people of color to migrate to white countries comes at the threat of life and death, which is relevant to having been emotionally and psychologically dominated by whites. For example, in Dover, England, 58 Chinese were found dead from suffocation after stowing away in an airtight vessel. They had paid criminals to smuggle them into the country in hopes of seeking asylum and eventual entry. The inability of unskilled immigrants of color to enter states of the European Union has led to such desperate loss of life [3].

Despite the oppression to which immigrant populations are subjected, their worldwide experiences with hostile immigration are apparent wherever they have attempted to assimilate into white Western populations. On more than one occasion, they have encountered difficulties in their attempts to enter the mainstream of white Western societies, in an effort to improve their quality of life. Unlike the first wave of white immigrants from Europe, immigrants from South America and Third World nations have been subjected to various forms of skin color discrimination when they arrived in the United States. Such discrimination is active within daily life, as well as at the micro level of common human interactions. Subsequently, those in social work and other human service occupations where human interaction is critical are then trained to handle the keenest aspects of emotional and psychological adjustment, with hardly any consideration given to the social and cultural gaps perpetuated by skin color. In fact, most social work faculties and academia in general have gone through their entire educational experience with not a word mentioned about skin color issues. Therefore, it should come as no surprise that students and faculties alike have not understood the role of color, in both their perpetration of immigrant discrimination and their experiences as immigrants who are discriminated against. For many reasons, the topic in practically every sector of the academy and the society at large has remained an unspeakable taboo. This inability to publicly acknowledge such an insidious social ill helps sustain it. It serves the tenets of racism and the mainstream status quo into which immigrants must assimilate. In the aftermath, immigrants of color as a victim-group population idealize racist traditions as a means of embracing the American Dream. Thus, upon reaching American shores, an immigrant's first experience with the perpetration of victim-group discrimination is the denigration of dark-skinned Americans—particularly of African descent, that is, African-Americans. This historical exercise of racist oppression is not limited to white or any particular Third World immigrants. Victim-group discrimination is perpetrated by dark-skinned immigrants of African descent who insist they are not black, despite skin color that identifies them as African-Americans. By emphatically differentiating themselves from African-Americans who have been denigrated in American culture, dark-skinned, victim-group populations serve the racist traditions of the postcolonial white status quo. Ultimately, they succumb to acting out victim-group discrimination and the perpetuation of their own victim-group demise.

Discrimination when formal, as in antebellum school segregation, or informal, as in the antebellum social interactions between blacks and whites, can be neither understood nor assessed without a frame of reference. This is true not only for the antebellum period but until and including the urbanized, modern-day era.

The black/white discrimination dichotomy of the past is no longer an appropriate paradigm to address the various forms of discrimination associated with immigrant populations. In the aftermath of Third World migration, where many newly arrived immigrants not only carry the stigma of dark skin themselves but abhor dark skin, the black/white dichotomy of discrimination cannot accommodate them within its logic or its limited frame of reference. However, people of color have been no less given to the dictates of black/white discrimination in their personal and group behaviors toward one other, as a victim-group population subject to the racist aftermath of Western colonization. While some might arrive upon American shores more than willing to subscribe to the humane tenets of social justice and equality for all, many bring antiblack prejudice with them, which are exacerbated by white racism once they arrived. In association with their experience as new arrivals, discriminated against by the American mainstream, these immigrants may have their aspirations dampened. This dampening affect, in their initial encounters with discrimination and the historical prejudices gained from colonial aversions to dark skin as victims, is a prerequisite to immigrant victim-group discrimination illustrated in the following example.

As a nation in the midst of an economic crisis, Americans are increasingly expressing concerns about the immigrant population. A large number insist that, increasingly, immigrants have proven themselves to be a social and economic burden to the country. Many of the concerns Americans express border on stereotypes associated with jobs, housing, and welfare benefits. Other Americans express concern for the cultural impact of immigrants, especially regarding Mexicans, who seem averse to speaking English. Despite this concern, a considerable number of Americans remain largely divided on what the overall impact will be of immigrants upon the nation. Their concerns range from those who contend that immigrants will contribute to American society while others believe that immigrants will threaten traditional American values, making America something it was never meant to be.

In an effort to address the issue of illegal immigration, the Pew Research Center for the People & the Press and the Pew Hispanic Center conducted a national survey. The survey was administered from February 8 to March 7, 2009, and consisted of 2000 adults. Included were separate surveys of another 800 adults living in each of five metropolitan areas: Phoenix, Las Vegas, Chicago, Raleigh-Durham, and Washington, DC.

The statistical account of the immigrant population has become increasingly formidable. According to respected sources, there are currently 11.5–12 million unauthorized immigrants (illegal aliens) residing in the United States. About 53% of Americans believe that those residing in the country illegally should be required by law to return to their homeland. Conversely, another 40% are of the opinion that illegal immigrants should be granted some kind of legal provision that would allow them to remain legally. More confusing is the fact that, of those Americans who contend illegal immigrants should return to their homelands, nearly 50% believe that some should be allowed to remain under a temporary work program. Generally, Americans are divided about equally relative to three strategies for addressing immigrants residing in the country illegally: 32% support their staying permanently; 32%

support their staying temporarily for work, assuming they will leave at some point; while 27% believe all illegal aliens should be sent home immediately. Thus, according to statistics, most Americans to some extent prefer that illegal aliens be sent home.

Americans are also divided as to how the nation should address the flow of illegal immigrants across the Mexican border. After being given three options for stemming the flow of immigrants from Mexico, 49% of Americans support increasing the penalties for those employers who hire illegal immigrants. Another 33 1/3% support a hiring increase in the number of border patrol officers available to enforce border restrictions. Lastly, 9% support the construction of more fences to control the flow of illegal immigrants from Mexico into the American population [4]. Subsequently, the attitude of Americans toward the immigrant population is a complex illustration of indifference or ambiguity, as suggested by the demographic statistics contained in Table 11.4 [4].

Table 11.4 The attitudes of Americans toward the immigrant population, 2009

	Area burden (%)	Threaten values (%)
Republicans	56	53
College graduate	43	42
Not college graduate	62	58
Democrats	51	47
College graduate	32	31
Not college graduate	59	53

In Table 11.4, Republicans (56%) are more opposed to immigrants than are Democrats (51%). Those Republicans who are college educated (43%) oppose immigrants compared to fewer Democrats (32%). Republicans who have no college degree (62%) opposed immigrants more often than like Democrats (59%). Regarding the belief that immigrants threaten traditional values, Republicans (53%) exceeded Democrats (47%). Republicans who are college grads (42%) exceeded Democrats (31%). Finally, Republicans who are not college educated (58%) exceeded similar Democrats (53%) in believing immigrants will threaten traditional values. Hence, it is reasonable to assume by empirical data and the surveys conducted by various agencies that immigrants from Mexico and other nonwhite populations do not experience a welcome assimilation into the American mainstream qualifying them for subjection to racial discrimination less relevant to the first wave of white immigrants from Europe. Hence, the American experience includes discrimination in various forms as a social norm.

Whether or not Americans are ambivalent toward immigrants, the number who consider them a burden on the country is considerable. When immigrants such as the Chinese are willing to risk their lives for the opportunity to assimilate into Western countries, their motivation for victim-group discrimination is apparent in the risks

they are willing to take. Such discrimination on occasion may exceed that associated with white immigrants from Europe, resulting in victim-group discrimination, which dark-skinned Americans and immigrants alike must endure.

Victim-group discrimination by immigrants of color has been ignored for the most part by mainstream scholars. In an effort to fill the void, Robert E. Washington [5] investigated this phenomenon and called it “brown racism.” He contends that no race relation issue in the modern era has been as insulated from academic scrutiny as has the issue of victim-group people of color who discriminate against other victim-group people of color. The term brown racism was selected to describe the issue, not in the literal sense but in the figurative sense. The perpetrators of brown racism, according to Washington, include immigrants who are Chinese, East Indian, Filipino, and mestizo. They, in particular, are guilty of brown racism given that racially they occupy an intermediate status along the black/white, race/skin color hierarchy. In behavioral terms, the aforementioned victim groups act out various forms of discrimination against darker-skinned victim groups, particularly individuals of African descent.

Victim-group discrimination among immigrant people of color is practiced throughout the Third World and Western countries. The phenomenon came into dramatic focus through film several years ago in a dramatization of the life of Egypt’s leader, Anwar Sadat. A well-known, dark-skinned, African-American actor—Louis Gossett—was hired for the role of Sadat, which insulted portions of the Egyptian public. Indicative of victim-group discrimination, protesters objected to a dark-skinned African-American portraying the slain leader. Apparently, the scheduled telecast of this film was cancelled after the vehement protest [6]. Light-skinned Egyptian immigrants who migrate to the United States also discriminate similarly against African-Americans, as a consequence of having been dominated by Eurocentric influences.

The Eurocentric influences leading to victim-group discrimination are no less apparent among Chinese immigrants than among Egyptians. Similarly, the Chinese government was recently subjected to international embarrassment after a racial incident involving Chinese and African students in China; the Chinese students violently attacked African students at a Chinese university [5]. The historical prejudice held by Chinese for all non-Chinese people is particularly intense, especially regarding dark-skinned persons of African descent.

The Indian caste system is a tradition that spans centuries of Asian-Indian culture. In India, not only are persons of African descent despised but any among dark-skinned Indians are despised as well. Thus, according to Washington [5], there have been numerous reports of victim-group discrimination directed at African students in India; the students find themselves the victims of social isolation and relegated to pariah group status [5]. What is more, in Eastern and Southern Africa there are large Indian communities that may have arrived during British colonialism, which would account for victim-group discrimination against African-descended peoples. Thus, prior to their migration to the United States, immigrant Indians have also detested associations with Africans or any other dark-skinned peoples, by virtue of Indian culture in which they are viewed as racially inferior. The tendency of Indian

immigrants to view African-Americans as racially inferior vis-à-vis victim-group discrimination was dramatically illustrated in the murder trial of Indian immigrant Chiman Rai, accused and convicted of having his non-Indian daughter-in-law killed.

On October 10, 2006, journalists Beth Warren and Jeffery Scott, of the *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, reported the murder of an African-American woman, Sparkle Reid Rai [7]. Sparkle Reid was told by her Indian-Asian fiancé, “Ricky” Rai, that his parents had died; Ricky had convinced her that his mother had been killed during an earthquake in India the year before. The husband’s secrecy happened because his parents did not approve of the marriage, as Sparkle Reid was black. According to the Reid family, the husband’s family had gone so far as to offer Reid \$10,000 to break up with their son. When Sparkle would not accept payment from Ricky’s father, Chiman Rai, the 67-year-old patriarch, living in Jackson, Mississippi, acted to have her killed. Police contend that he initiated a plot, sought, and hired a contract killer through business contacts. After being paid, the killer and his companions went to the Ricky Rai residence, in Union City, Georgia, under the pretense of delivering a package. When 22-year-old Sparkle Rai opened the door, a 300-pound, ex-convict attacked her with a knife. When the attack was over, Sparkle had been brutally stabbed at least 13 times in the back, neck, chest, and ribs. To ensure her death, the attacker then strangled her and slit her throat. According to detectives, 20-year-old Ricky Rai discovered her body when he returned home from work. Fortunately, the couple’s 7-month-old daughter had not been harmed. Initially, the case could not be solved for lack of evidence, until 4 years later. The killer’s female companion had been arrested by Atlanta police officers. It was through her testimony that Chiman Rai was arrested.

I think almost from the beginning his family opposed their relationship, said Lt. Lee Brown, an investigator with the Union City police department. They’re Indian, and it was real taboo for him to marry outside the family, and it was even more taboo for him to marry a black girl [7].

Prosecutors sought the death penalty for Chiman Rai, whose attorney insisted that his client was innocent. A number of Rai’s African-American colleagues and friends believed him. To the contrary, evidence revealed that Rai had asked a former business associate to arrange hiring a hit man.

Sparkle Reid had met Indian-Asian Ricky Rai in 1998, in Louisville, Kentucky, where she had moved there to live with her grandmother after having failed college courses. She found work as a desk clerk at a motel, managed by her soon-to-be fiancé Ricky. After working there for 6 months, Sparkle Reid became pregnant by Ricky Rai. According to detectives, the Reid family was convinced that the Rai family had initially approved of their 18-year-old son dating a black woman. However, in May of 1999, the couple moved to Atlanta. It is difficult to establish when the Rai family began to disapprove of their son’s relationship with Sparkle, but it had become a problem.

Shortly after moving to Atlanta, Sparkle Rai gave birth to a daughter, who was given an Indian-Asian name out of respect for Ricky’s culture. According to Sparkle’s father, she had become evasive when he asked about marriage, because

the Rai family had long before arranged "...an Indian woman set aside for [Ricky] to marry." After Ricky said that his parents had died, the elder Reid learned on the day of his daughter's wedding that Ricky's parents were alive. Apparently, a family member had overheard a telephone conversation that revealed the truth. Ricky Rai later became angry at Sparkle's aunt, for telephoning his parents and informing them of their son's marriage to Sparkle. This is what the Reid family believes incited Chiman Rai to have Sparkle murdered.

After Sparkle's murder, Ricky Rai appeared to be a normal, Asian-American adult. He relocated to a Chicago suburb, where he met a local businessman named Salil Gandhi, who described Rai as someone who boasted of the girls he had been with. When news of the murder reached the Chicago area, Rai's friends were "dumb-founded and in shock for several days after learning about the killing. We met him within a couple of months of this horrible thing happening," Gandhi said. "He didn't show any of the emotions you would expect" [7]. Gandhi is an Indian-Asian, married to an Indian-Asian woman. He contends that many Asian-Americans are quite happy in mixed-race marriages, but marriage to blacks may be disapproved.

But most of our parents would prefer we marry someone from India. And, for the uneducated Indians who aren't as worldly or metropolitan, who might have come from smaller villages, marrying a black person would be about as bad as it could get [7].

Ricky later married a Chicago-area Indian woman who, like his family, is also Hindu. According to the Fulton County District Attorney, Rai's new wife had not known about his previous marriage, daughter, or his first wife's murder. After spending his youth in India, in 1970 the senior Rai moved his family to Jackson, Mississippi, where he taught math at Alcorn State University. The retired dean responsible for Rai's supervision described him as an "excellent teacher who never showed signs of bigotry against blacks." After 10 years at Alcorn State, Rai stopped teaching and opened a small grocery store in Jackson.

Blacks who worked in Mississippi with the elder Rai are unconvinced Chiman is responsible for a racist murder. Few members of Jackson's black business community believe Rai could have taken part in murder. He is reputed to have helped Jackson's black poor, but police records reveal a different character: In 1985, Rai received a sentence of 5-years probation for taking part in illegal food stamp trafficking. Over a decade later, Jackson police raided his store and confiscated televisions, bicycles, and other items they believed were stolen. They did not prosecute him, and Rai left Jackson in 1998, moving to Kentucky where he managed a 100-room hotel near Louisville's main airport. He was arrested there for Sparkle Rai's murder. Prosecutors contend it was in Jackson, Mississippi, that the elder Rai met the two black men whom he hired to murder his African-American daughter-in-law.

The arranged murder of Sparkle Reid Rai is by far an exception to the norm. Most Asian-Americans are peaceful, law-abiding citizens, some of whom are happily married to African-Americans or members of other victim-group populations. Asian-Americans, in fact, while a victim-group population, represent a diversity of

phenotypes, languages, cultures, and nationalities. However, most have been colonized, conquered, or otherwise dominated by Eurocentric influences. Their identification as people of color suggests they have been the victims of racial discrimination not irrelevant to their tendency to discriminate. After internalizing dominant-group norms via the American assimilation process, Asian-Americans actively partake in the denigration of dark-skinned Americans because such denigration has become an American norm. In addition, despite their diversity, many Asian-Americans culturally adhere to a strict tradition of human hierarchy, which places those darkest in skin color at the lowest status. African-Americans in particular represent those among the most despised, as manifested in Asian Eurogamous marital patterns, beauty standards, and group interactions. Therefore, Asian-Americans, being people of color, are both discriminated against and the perpetrators of discrimination. Associated with their American assimilation experience as immigrants, they then manifest as much as other people of color victimism acted out in their victim-group discrimination against African-Americans, which in extreme circumstances includes murder.

The phenomenon of victim-group discrimination among immigrants is not localized to the United States. A similar situation exists in England, Canada, France, and other Western countries where Third World brown and black groups live as minorities. For the most part, as a consequence of colonial domination, brown victim-group communities avoid association with black victim-group communities. In fact, in all of the above-mentioned white-dominated countries, one finds far more fraternization between whites and browns and between whites and blacks than between browns and blacks, a situation reflected in the difficulties the latter two groups have experienced in attempting to form minority political coalitions. It should be noted that this is because brown racism is not without its intrinsic irony. Brown groups themselves have long been the objects of racism and of the racial prejudice of whites, about which they bitterly complain. In fact, according to Washington [5] nations such as India, Pakistan, and Egypt were among the harshest critics of South African apartheid. Yet, oddly, they failed to recognize the problem of victim-group discrimination in their own societies. Thus far, the social sciences have also ignored the problem of brown racism, evidenced by the absence of a term for the direct specification of the phenomenon. Insofar as white social scientists have focused on color prejudices in the aforementioned countries at all, they in particular have tended to view such prejudices as peculiar to specific cultures and not as characteristic of a general, worldwide postcolonial pattern. This point of view goes far to explain why there has been little attention paid to the issue [5].

Victim-group discrimination as it exists among Indian-Asians and other victim-group populations in the United States, while formidable pales in comparison to that among immigrant Latinos, due to population size. In 2009, Latino-Americans represent the largest nonwhite group in the United States [8]. Their relationship with African-Americans has the potential to inflame racial tensions both socially and politically in the aftermath of their victim-group discrimination. Research suggests this given that Latino immigrants are likely to hold negative views about African-Americans. What is more, unlike many other groups, they are likely to have arrived

in the United States having brought such views with them absent negative personal experiences with African-Americans.

Dr. Paula McClain, Professor of political science at Duke University in North Carolina, conducted an investigation, funded by a grant from the Ford Foundation, to substantiate this theory. Other contributors to the study include Niambi M. Carter, Victoria M. DeFrancesco Soto, and Monique L. Lyle of Duke; Jeffrey D. Grynviski of the University of Chicago; Shayla C. Nunnally of the University of Connecticut; Thomas J. Scotto of West Virginia University; J. Alan Kendrick of St. Augustine's College; and Gerald F. Lackey and Kendra Davenport Cotton of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

In North Carolina, the Latino population has experienced an increase in the number of immigrants. According to her investigation, Latino immigrants who resided among African-Americans were more likely to hold negative views about them. Such views were inspired by their desire to have "more in common with whites" despite the fact that whites did not acknowledge the same desired commonality with Latinos.

McClain's 2006 study was a thorough investigation, entitled "Racial Distancing in a Southern City: Latino Immigrants' Views of Black Americans" [9]. Findings were based upon a 2003 survey consisting of 500 Latino, African-American, and white residents of Durham, North Carolina, which includes one of the fastest-growing Latino populations in the South. Items of the investigation were listed in both English and Spanish. Included were 500 Durham residents, consisting of 160 whites, 151 blacks, and 167 Latinos. A similar study in Houston, Texas, conducted a decade earlier drew similar conclusions in that Latino immigrants in particular expressed more negative views of African-Americans than African-Americans expressed about Latinos. Thus, one of the most salient points of both studies is the fact that African-Americans, while denigrated by Latino immigrants, did not hold similar views about Latinos themselves despite victim-group discrimination. Fortunately, the more educated a Latino was, and the more social contact was had with African-Americans, the less likely Latinos were to hold negative views. Social contact is more likely to dissolve negative stereotypes immigrants might have about blacks. According to one commentator:

I think that's a pivotal variable, especially for Latino immigrants who are learning English and who have not had much contact with blacks, who are unfortunately influenced by the American lens and vocabulary of race and what white America has constructed in terms of stereotypes of blacks [10].

McClain decided to conduct her study in the South because Latino immigrants began to migrate there only in the last 10–15 years. Reasons for the increase may be attributed to the 1994 North Atlantic Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), an emerging global economy, and the fact that there is an increasing market for unskilled, low-wage workers—many of whom are available from Mexico. Their potential for victim-group discrimination presents a formidable challenge in that in 1990 Latinos comprised 1% of the Durham city population. A little more than a decade later, in 2001, their numbers increased to 8.6% of the total population. The country of origin

for these Latino immigrants is most often Mexico. This increase in the Latino population led McClain to investigate what impact their immigration would have upon the black/white affiliation. She assumed this to be significant because, "No section of the country has been more rigidly defined along a black-white racial divide [than the South]. How these new Latino immigrants situated themselves vis-à-vis black Americans has profound implications for the social and political fabric of the South" [11]. The results of McClain's investigation suggest that almost 59% of Latino immigrants believe that "few or almost no blacks are hard working." Another 33 1/3% of Latino immigrants report that blacks are "hard to get along with."

While Latino immigrants hold negative views about blacks, blacks did not respond in kind toward Latino immigrants. McClain's survey showed that blacks view Latinos much more favorably than Latinos view blacks. It was calculated that 72% of blacks believe most or almost all Latinos are hard working and 42.8% report that most or almost all Latinos are easy to get along with. Lastly, 32.6% of blacks believe few or no Latinos could be trusted.

Ironically, when Southern whites were questioned about the same information, fewer than 10% held similarly negative views toward African-Americans. As a result of this difference, McClain concluded that Latino immigrants were not assuming their negative attitudes about blacks from whites. In fact, the negative attitudes held by Latino immigrants about blacks more than likely were brought with them from their mother countries. Earlier investigations regarding race in Latin America concluded that blacks "represent the bottom rungs of society," prompting investigators to conclude that Latino immigrants "might bring prejudicial attitudes with them," which is relevant to the current study.

African-American scholars such as Dr. Ronald Walters, Professor in government and politics at the University of Maryland, concur with much of what was found by the Duke study. Walters, having spent considerable time in Brazil, can attest to the desire on the part of Latinos to be white. This is verified by the fact that more than 78% of Latino immigrants identified with whites and 52.8% reported having the least in common with African-Americans. This is so despite most Latinos being an indigenous people. They understand clearly the negative implications associated with being black or nonwhite. According to Walters, "We're dealing with a conflict between a Latin American conception of color and an American conception of color" [11].

Despite most Latino immigrants wanting to be white, whites do not feel any such connection with Latino immigrants. McClain's study reported that 47.5% of surveyed whites admitted to having the least in common with Latinos. Conversely, 22.2% of whites reported having the most in common with Latino immigrants. Pertaining to blacks, 45.9% of whites report having the most in common with African-Americans. No doubt, the issue of immigration is relevant to the attitudes of whites toward Latinos. Many whites have used the immigration debate to successfully encourage racist opposition to Latino immigrants. For example, according to the Southern Poverty Law Center, the number of documented white racist groups increased from 144 in 2007 to 173 in 2008 [12]. Such an increase represents a 20% rise. The members of these groups, including vigilante border groups and

motorcycle gangs, do not attack immigration policies, but violently attack immigrants themselves. Their activities accounted for a 40% increase in the hate crimes committed by whites against Latinos, between 2003 and 2007 according to FBI statistics [12]. This data is a dramatic illustration of the postcolonial impact of white domination of the Latino immigrant psyche.

The results of McClain's study do not differ significantly from past investigations. In the mid-nineteenth-century Mississippi, Chinese expressed similar denigration of blacks and idealization of whites, as did Cubans in the mid-twentieth-century Miami. All such immigrants are members of a victim group whose idealization of whiteness and light skin contributes to victimism in sustaining their own demise.

The anecdotal accounts of victim-group discrimination by immigrants are no less dramatic than the surveys conducted by university scholars. Until very recently, not many Cubans lived in the United States; Cuba had to some extent been a thriving nation just off the American coast and, although there have always been some measure of Cuban immigration, it wasn't until Castro's revolution that a significant increase occurred. Cubans then arrived in droves, exiled to the United States. Many were light-skinned merchants and middle-class businessmen who had lost everything to the revolutionary government. Because most left for political reasons, they were able to gain entry into the United States with relative ease. They have been a potent political force and tend to be very conservative in their political views. Thus, it should come as no surprise that in 1970 census data about 95% of Cuban Latinos living in the United States reported themselves as white. Logically, it would make little sense to report being black, for a white identification could not possibly hurt assimilation. What is more, according to Cuban census data, about 2% of the same group—primarily Chinese—saw no need to report having Asian blood. That is not to say that Cubans were so intent on concealing their black blood when coming to the United States, though that may have been true. But, as one researcher reported, many of the dark-skinned Cubans felt they would face too much discrimination by electing to leave Cuba for the United States. Those who emigrate faced housing discrimination in the United States when attempting to locate in Cuban neighborhoods. Therefore, when dark-skinned Cubans came to the United States most tended to settle in the North, while their light-skinned counterparts settled in Miami. The skin color baggage brought by darker-skinned immigrants did not help their assimilation into the United States or the subjection to victim-group discrimination by light-skinned Cuban counterparts.

The tendency of Latino immigrants toward victim-group discrimination should come as little surprise. The desire to be white extends quite commonly beyond Cubans who discriminate, as documented in judicial litigation. Such discrimination was apparent in a 2002 case involving a Mexican restaurant owner in San Antonio, Texas. The white restaurant supervisor contends that he was ordered by the Latino restaurant owner to discriminate against his Latino employees, on the basis of having dark skin. Specifically, the white supervisor was ordered not to allow "dark-skinned" Mexicans to work in the dining room where they might be exposed to public view. The case was settled before going to court; the restaurant owner settled for \$100,000 in damages [13].

Travel brochures for the island of Puerto Rico aptly show a rich variation in skin color and other phenotypes among its people. Vacationing tourists are impressed by the seeming lack of color prejudice that residents proudly proclaim. Unmentioned, however, is the perception of blatant discrimination against dark-skinned Puerto Ricans, invisible to the casual observer but substantiated as fact by documented litigation. This litigation is typological in that it accounts for charges of skin color discrimination across group and gender lines and within the same. In fact, the above-mentioned case of San Antonio victim-group discrimination was not the first. That of *Felix v. Marquez* [14] establishes the truth of victim-group discrimination on the basis of skin color as having a long and tenacious history among Latinos.

The previously mentioned case of Felix (plaintiff) versus the lighter-skinned Marquez (defendant), litigated in 1981 by the US District Court of the District of Columbia, should come as little surprise. Both the plaintiff and defendant are Latino immigrants who, having experienced Latino culture, were well aware of the unspoken but no less significant manifestations of victim-group discrimination by skin color hierarchy. As Latino employees of the Office of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (OCPRW), in Washington, DC, they emigrated from their island nation with a reality too taboo to publicly acknowledge. The plaintiff, alleging that the defendant did not promote her on the basis of skin color discrimination, was acknowledged only in the moment of excessive suffering. Otherwise, the introducing of the personnel cards of 28 of her former fellow employees would have gone unnoticed. She would not have testified that, among them, only two were as dark or darker in skin color than she—because Latino norms suggest skin color discrimination does not exist. In fact, it was the plaintiff's belief and statement that all other employees in the office were light-skinned and was not by coincidence. Despite that in summation the court determined that the plaintiff was not promoted in grade for legitimate business reasons, having nothing whatever to do with her skin color, does not suggest a lack of merit pertaining to the population at large. Latinos know this only too well, as do the most astute of outside observers.

Thus, while Latino immigrants aspire to be white—resulting in their victim-group discrimination—unlike European immigrants they are prohibited from structural integration into Western society [15]. Their willingness to take part in victim-group discrimination regardless reflects a desire not to devalue themselves by becoming white, but to improve their social status and quality of life. In so doing, Latino immigrants further develop disdain for dark skin because the disdain is an aspect of postcolonial white domination [16]. They recognize the preferences of various Western institutions for light skin. The logical outcome for Latino immigrants is then an effort to succeed by disassociation from their darker-skinned brethren by denigration. For those who labor, unaware of the inherent limitations, failure is the end result. Furthermore, since quality of life closely correlates with having a color approximate to the Western ideal, light skin has emerged as critical to an immigrant's ability to integrate and embrace the ideal [17]. Consequently, centuries of colonial domination have predisposed Latinos to the internalization of Western ideals, which are in every way alien. Logically, their common experience has fostered a sense of cohesion and solidarity. However, under the circumstances, common bonds

between those who are nonwhite through variations in color are a myth manifested in the immigrant's desire to be white. Accordingly, this requires that those of darkest skin, such as African-Americans, be subjected to various forms of discrimination perpetrated by the dominated group Latino as well as the dominant-group white. In the aftermath, victim-group discrimination—as victimism—prevails, resulting in the newest form of oppression, facilitated by cooperation from those who are oppressed.

Most investigations of discrimination have focused upon that which transpires between whites and nonwhites. No doubt, the discrimination by whites directed at nonwhites has been the most dramatic and insidious in the aftermath of colonial domination. However, to address discrimination within the confines of the white perspective is misleading. Given the pervasiveness of discrimination in American society, to ignore brown and other forms of racism as discrimination is not only callous but also pathological. That is because it facilitates the continuation and normalization of both forms. Therefore, any effort to eliminate discrimination as a whole must address that which extends from people of color and other victim-group populations in a global postcolonial context. In that way, the immigrant experience can be more clearly defined and enable a viable assimilation process.

References

1. Lancaster, R. (Oct 1991). Skin color, race, and racism in Nicaragua. *Ethnology*, 30(4), 339–353.
2. [World Bank] Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. (1999). *World development indicators*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
3. Cohen, R. (2000, June 23). Britain charges Dutch truck driver in migrants' deaths. *New York Times*. <http://www.nytimes.com/2000/06/23/world/britain-charges-dutch-truck-driver-in-migrants-deaths.html>. Accessed 26 June 2009.
4. Pew Research Center for the People & the Press. (2006). America's immigration quandary. <http://people-press.org/report/274/americas-immigration-quandary>. Accessed 19 April 2009.
5. Washington, R. (1990). Brown racism and the formation of a world system of racial stratification. *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, 4(2), 209–227.
6. Morsy, S. (1996). Beyond the honorary “white” classification of Egyptians. In S. Gregory and R. Sanjek (Eds.). *Race*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
7. Warren, B., & Scott, J. (2006). Kin grapple with alleged contract killing. *Atlanta-Journal Constitution*. <http://www.bnvillage.co.uk/1376008-post1.html>. Accessed 19 April 2009.
8. Devries, L. (2009). Hispanics now largest U.S. minority. CBS News online. <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2003/01/21/national/main537369.shtml>. Accessed 19 April 2009.
9. McClain, P. D., Carter, N. M., DeFrancesco Soto, V. M., Lyle, M. L., Grynaviski, J. D., Nunnally, S. C., Scotto, T. J., Kendrick, J. A., Lackey, G. F., & Davenport Cotton, K. (2006). Racial distancing in a southern city: Latino immigrants' views of black Americans. *Journal of Politics*, 68(3), 571–584. Available at http://journalofpolitics.org/art68_3.html#a7
10. [Americans for Legal Immigration] McClain, P. (2006). New study: many Latino immigrants do not like black Americans. <http://www.alipac.us/article1343.html>. Accessed 26 June 2009.
11. Asquith, C. (2006). Scholars ask why Latinos view blacks poorly. http://www.diverseeducation.com/artman/publish/article_6086.shtml. Accessed 17 April 2009.

12. Southern Poverty Law Center (Spring, 2009). Hate groups in the U.S. continue to expand <http://www.splcenter.org/intel/intelreport/article.jsp?aid=1027>. Accessed 26 June 2009.
13. Findley, H., Garrott, S., & Wheatley, R. (2003–2004). Color discrimination: differentiate at your peril. *Journal of Individual Employment Rights*, 11(1), 31–38.
14. *Felix v. Marquez*. (1981). WL 242, 24 Empl. Prac. Dec. P 31, 279 (D.C., Sept. 11, 1980) (NO. 78-2314).
15. Kalmijn, M. (1996). The socioeconomic assimilation of Caribbean American blacks. *Social Forces*, 74(3), 911–930.
16. Martinez, E. (1993). Beyond black/white: the racisms of our time. *Social Justice*, 1–2(51–52), 22–34.
17. Hall, R. E. (1994). The “bleaching syndrome”: implications of light skin for Hispanic American assimilation. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 16(3), 307–314.

Chapter 12

Conclusion: Diversity in the Future

Discrimination on the basis of race, in the United States and elsewhere, is a tenacious social pathology that has plagued Western civilization. It is among the most potent topics for public discussion, in particular among interracial audiences. Most scholars trace the origins of discrimination to the Atlantic slave trade and European colonization. Subsequently, African-Americans are cast as victims and Euro-Americans by way of the slave trade as the perpetrators of African-American victimization. Eventually such victimization spread to other non-European, non-biracial, male, gay, and lesbian immigrant populations, whose demographic status located them on the periphery of the Western power structure. However, the origin of racial and other forms of discrimination is much more extensive than the Western power structure, which historically Western scholars in particular have been unwilling to acknowledge. The inability to do that has dampened the worth of scientific investigation, in that science and the academic community at large has been misled by a simplistic dichotomous view of discrimination. Motivated by their allegiance to the racial status quo, mainstream scholars have elected to ignore the works of victim-group scholars who trace the origins of racial discrimination to its prehistoric genesis. Doing so, they presume, would be an affront to the academy that has contributed to sustaining the current world order. In fact, tracing the origins of racial discrimination to its genesis offers the best opportunity for a solution and thus its eventual demise. By expanding the search for facts independent of race and political sensitivities, the worth of scientific investigation will be enhanced having been freed from dictates of the current status quo. Additionally, discrimination—as it pertains to people of color and other victim-group populations—will be amenable to acknowledgment and subsequently more rigorous scientific investigation. Under the circumstances of such investigation, victim-group discrimination as per victimism will be revealed as a contingent of the more traditionally acknowledged Western version. The fact is discrimination, perpetrated by postcolonials and victim-group populations, extends from a common genesis consisting of the following chronology: (a) the prehistoric glacial evolution of mankind; (b) color confrontations as perceived inadequacy; (c) Western colonization; (d) development of the authoritarian personality; and (e) the ecological perspective relative to people of color and other victim-group populations who discriminate. The hegemony of Western

scholars and social work activists in their scientific investigation has been the most potent obstacle in distorting the aforementioned.

In 1994, two relatively obscure Euro-Americans Richard Herrnstein and Charles Murray published a widely noted book called *The Bell Curve* [1]. They professed to explain the racial intelligence differentials between blacks and whites using statistical analysis. No doubt, differentials do exist as for all groups for various reasons irrelevant to race. The authors' all but stated purpose was to warn society of the social, political, and economic consequences of racial intelligence differentials for the construction of comprehensive policies. The obvious unstated purpose was to serve the subjugation of dark-skinned people under the environmental auspices of the lighter-skinned, postcolonial status quo. Unfortunately, the effort failed scientifically as *The Bell Curve* is rife with pseudo-facts and statistical errors in suggesting that African-Americans by virtue of being black are endowed with a gene for inferior intelligence. This hypothesis is based upon intelligence test score differentials between blacks, whites, and Asian-Americans. Without reference to any significant details, the authors conclude from such differentials that African-Americans value intelligence tests equal to that of Asian-Americans and whites and that the tests are a valid measure of intelligence. Given the intelligence test differentials between Northerners and Southerners, the upper and lower class men and women not acknowledged in the book not only reduces the scientific quality of the work but leaves the suspicion of an ulterior motive. It is not prohibitive that such research be conducted but that it should be subject to scientific rigor worthy of legitimate scholarship. Despite this, *The Bell Curve* was a monumental financial success in Europe and America, where lighter-skinned, postcolonials dominate the political, economic, and social environments. Upon release, it is reputed to have sold 400,000 copies worldwide [2]. Many Americans—and conceivably some conservative blacks—displayed a keen interest in the book. It was successful in resurrecting an old stereotype, which proposed that blacks are intellectually inferior by genetic heritage. Similar beliefs have been assigned to other people of color, such as Native Americans—whose reference in the book was secondary to that of blacks. Global interest is evidence of a loosely defined conspiracy on the part of lighter-skinned, postcolonial folk to dominate and control the environment of human reality by professed genetic superiority, giving license to discriminate. The need on the part of some to scientifically validate white supremacy, associated with racial discrimination, is a consequence of their prehistoric evolution within a hostile glacial environment where control, domination, and aggression were indeed the sustenance of life. In 1978, Michael Bradley applied this rationale in his explanation of white supremacy, which culminated eventually into victimism as victim-group discrimination by victim-group populations.

Michael Bradley is a light-skinned American, of mixed-race genetic parentage, who describes himself as a white man. He is currently a Canadian citizen and author of a book titled *The Iceman Inheritance* [3], which is no less controversial than *The Bell Curve*. However, the scholastic quality of Bradley's book exceeds that of Herrnstein and Murray's work. While Bradley is critical, he is careful to direct his criticism in the first person and never fails to accept responsibility for the

atrocities he associates with the West. Western scholars, while they embraced Herrnstein and Murray's work, have not embraced Bradley's work or acknowledged the scholarly worth of his theory. Some have responded with uninformed criticisms given to emotional platitudes, no doubt as a consequence of his less than complimentary accusations. Bradley has found an audience, however, among Afrocentrists. From their perspective, *The Iceman Inheritance* is the first theoretical construct to logically explain the evolution of today's worldwide domination of dark-skinned people by those having light skin and the subsequent tendency to racial discrimination. Bradley attributes this domination to the prehistoric Western evolution within a hostile, unforgiving, glacial environment.

According to Bradley, during the prehistoric era, Caucasoids were forced to adapt to extreme glacial conditions, unlike darker-skinned people of color whose tropical surroundings accommodated nonviolence and viable human life. Scientific data exist to support this notion, as the impact of glacial adaptation can be found among lighter-skinned Caucasoids today. Bradley states:

These special adaptations had incidental side effects which resulted in an exceptionally aggressive psychology, an extreme expression of the Cronos complex, and a higher level of psychosexual conflict compared to all other races of men [3].

Thus, Bradley would differ with Herrnstein and Murray, attributing the advanced technological state of the postcolonial West not to its proposed superior intelligence but a tendency toward violence and aggression against the darker-skinned masses they perceive as an environmental threat. Such aggression is a prehistoric product of the hostile environmental experiences, which required domination and control in order to survive. No longer confronted by a hostile, glacial environment today, lighter-skinned Caucasoids have applied the same aggressive tendencies to dominate the human social, political, and economic environment by dispersing themselves geographically and culturally, at the expense of the darker-skinned members of mankind. This postcolonial penchant for aggression and environmental domination, while coincidental with glacial evolution, has resulted in a defensive mentality among today's Western populations. According to Bradley, advanced technology, chemical pollution, exploitation of earth's resources, and the ever-present threat of a nuclear confrontation are the end results. Furthermore, Bradley contends that the modern-day penchant for aggression among lighter-skinned postcolonials is manifested by their inability to cope well with intellectual conflict. That inability is relevant to the American Puritanical tradition, which denigrates sexual displacement activities intended to reduce aggressive behaviors within the human species. Bradley suggests, "We have a low frustration tolerance because glacial adaptation robbed us of sufficiently effective sexual displacement activities" [3].

Thus, Western problems in philosophical and religious conflicts derive from a glacial corruption of therapeutic primate behavior patterns initiated by light-skinned persons. In brief, this is Bradley's explanation of white supremacy and the ongoing attempt of Herrnstein and Murray to substantiate intellectual superiority as a rationale for discriminating against people of color. If successful, *The Bell Curve* will scientifically rationalize the worldwide subjugation of all victim-group populations

by their assumed superior counterparts who are predisposed to aggression and domination, according to Bradley, in the aftermath of having survived a hostile prehistoric glacial environment. With their eventual encounters with a human environment dominated by darker-skinned people, the lighter-skinned descendants of prehistoric Caucasians necessarily acted out prehistoric tendencies. They then applied the same aggressive domination, previously thought necessary to survive a hostile glacial environment, to nonwhite humanity. Extending from Bradley's work, an African-American psychiatrist acknowledged this modern-day color phenomenon and labeled it the Cress theory.

In 1970, Dr. Frances Cress Welsing established the Cress Theory of Color Confrontation and Racism [4]. The Cress theory is a clarification of skin color confrontation that seeks to explain discrimination and the current racial world order. As a scientist, Welsing takes the position that all observable human phenomena can be explained or, at least, are amenable to explanation by rigorous scientific investigation. No doubt, similar to Bradley, her work has sparked controversy among scholars, but it is no less scientifically significant. Those such as Herrnstein and Murray have been less apt to consider Welsing's explanation of Western world domination given its potential to challenge Western intellectual superiority. Their objective is an aggressive attempt by discrimination to dominate the human social, political, and economic environment. They intend to do so by arming social engineers and policy makers with scientific evidence that will standardize the postcolonial status quo. By reputation, the Cress theory lacks mainstream validation because its color explanation of black/white racial differentials undermines the current distribution of wealth and power.

In her formulation of the Cress theory, Welsing encountered the work of Neely Fuller. Fuller acknowledges the need for a functional behavior theory that could be applied by those seeking to bring about social change that would end discrimination. At the risk of controversy, Fuller suggests that there is one single explanation for the current world order associated with the subjugation of dark-skinned people by those who are lighter-skinned. On the basis of skin color, Fuller challenges his readers to identify and then to demonstrate the functional application of racial discrimination by any of the world's dark-skinned, nonwhite peoples. Since there is no functional racism among any of the world's "colored" people, the genesis of worldwide domination is "white" supremacy. That is not to suggest colored people are incapable of racist behaviors, as victimism suggests they are. However, in a postcolonial Western dominated world, nonwhites are ultimately the victims of the white supremacy process. Fuller places emphasis on the treatment of darker-skinned people of color within Western societal institutions, where racism can be verified by the obsession with intelligence testing. He instead systematizes racial discrimination via the patterns of relationships between those who are effectively without color and those who make color salient throughout humanity and who are thereby perceived as a formidable environmental threat.

The pronounced existence of color in blacks is perceived not only as an environmental threat but as a provocation as well. In an effort to rescue their self-esteem

in a color-norm world, some have responded with defensive mechanisms, including white supremacy, to account for feelings of skin color inadequacy. Initially, according to Welsing, they repressed the thought or sense of inadequacy. Eventually, this repression became deeply rooted and gained in complexity as the world moved toward increasing levels of heterogeneous social interaction. It resurfaced in the universal inability of Westerners to congregate in the presence of darker-skinned, nonwhite populations. Segregated schools, housing, and education throughout the West is explained by the Cress theory as the psychological discomfort experienced by those who, in the presence of their dark-skinned counterparts, are confronted with their skin color inadequacies as the prerequisite to a tendency to discriminate. Unfortunately, efforts on the part of some in the West to rescue their self-esteem in the wake of skin color issues have always been futile, in a human social environment dominated by people of color. Thus, their prehistoric penchant for aggression, in perceiving people of color as an environmental threat, culminated in an unprecedented effort to colonize the entire nonwhite world.

According to Harry Kitano [5], colonization is defined as the peopling of foreign territory previously settled by a native population with operatives from the mother country [5]. Since the Atlantic slave trade, another form of prehistoric aggression has prevailed through colonial powers. Colonial powers have consistently dealt with their subjects in one of three ways: eradication, exclusion, or assimilation [5]. More often than not, the victim groups exposed to such domination were influenced to perpetrate discrimination themselves, despite their skin color contrast with their lighter-skinned colonizers. Ironically, it is the colonial experience of people of color with Western domination that then facilitated their victim-group discrimination against other victim-group populations, which scientific investigation has all but subverted. Subsequently, the historical impact of colonization has predisposed dark-skinned and other victim-group populations to the internalization of prehistoric and postcolonial ideals.

The remaining European black colonies have been emancipated or otherwise gained their independence over the years. Some gained independence by confrontation while others were freed on moral grounds. However, as it pertains to feelings of color inadequacies, Western aggressive attempts at environmental domination prevail in this postcolonial era. While people of color are no longer relegated to overt colonization, they have succumbed to covert manifestations as victim-group discrimination. This form of discrimination cannot be fully understood without reference to Bradley's white racism and Welsing's subsequent feelings of skin color inadequacy. Both theories play a major role in describing the willingness of people of color and victim groups to oppress other people of color and other victim groups, despite that they might find the act objectionable.

According to Anthony Powell, it should not come as a shock that an unusually large number of African-American soldiers deserted while serving in the colonized Philippines; many joined the Filipino struggle for independence [6]. Even so, today's Filipino skin color hierarchy is ever so subtle but nonetheless exists both at home and abroad. In every country colonized by European powers, a light-skin hierarchy given to victim-group discrimination exists under similar circumstances,

including Cuba, Puerto Rico, Mexico, and Panama. In fact, Cuba is regarded by some such as Carlos Moore—a dark-skinned Cuban—as the most prejudiced society in the Hispanic Caribbean. The physical, social, and cultural mores exported by colonial powers were thus shaped and modified to effectively sustain people of color under a system of colonial domination. The beneficiary of course was the colonial motherland. The success of this system was largely dependent upon the experience of the first generation of people of color to be colonized [7]. Although their lives were directly impacted, dark-skinned and light-skinned people of color, prone to discriminate, would continue manifestations of colonization covertly reflected in their Western migration and color select marital patterns.

Language, bloodline, and urbanization became symbols of status among covertly colonized people of color in the modern era. In an effort to reach higher moral ground, postcolonial powers found another way to maintain control and/or dominate victim groups of color. Furthermore, the ability of these powers in affecting a social hierarchy by skin color was no less formidable than traditional overt colonization having an impact upon the psyche of victim-group populations. A system of social stratification that eventually overlapped with skin color and/or race can be summarized as follows: The postcolonial powers found a way to maintain environmental dominance via race criteria. They associated light skin with prestige, which meant that people characterized by dark skin were universally regarded as inferior. This reinforced sociocultural notions of human hierarchy. By the time overt colonization had come to an end, a subtle but no less effective covert system of colonization by hierarchy had been put in place that was particularly evident in the psychological ideals exhibited by people of color. In other words, the indigenous mores of native people had given way to the prehistoric influences of Western domination. That is not to say that racism per se is typical of people of color, but that their psyche in particular has not withstood the assault of covert postcolonial influences or their regard for mankind relative to status within society.

The common Western experience with oppressed nonwhite populations fostered a sense of superiority among similarly oppressed groups. However, under the circumstances, solidarity between oppressed whites and nonwhites was discouraged. Among all people of color, colonization remains a significant influence upon their societal status. Resulting influences preceded the indiscriminate application of alien skin color ideals among nonwhites. The uppermost in status became those whose color approximated that of the dominant mainstream white population [8]. In an effort to circumvent humiliation, people of color then accommodated a denigration of self. In the aftermath, their own oppression was enabled due to a differential in power, which motivated instances of stigmatization, as reflected in Eurogamy and various other forms of institutionalized hypergamy.

Covertly colonized people of color, who marry and settle in Western countries today, exhibit a color-based hierarchy commensurate with white somatic ideals. In the West, where race dominates, skin color is strictly applied to formal and informal group interaction among and between victim-group populations. Whereas Europeans may be differentiated by socially selected cultural traits, in the West people of color are distinguished by socially selected physical traits, that is, dark skin

[9]. Designation by physical group traits would have little or no meaning in the West if the dominant population did not recognize or acknowledge such traits as stigmata. Hence, in Western countries including the United States, the classification of nonwhites as being aliens is dependent on the perceptions and definitions held by members of the Western mainstream. Whereas some Europeans, such as darker-skinned Italians, did not fit the Western ideal initially, they are not now differentiated as alien to its skin color norm. They do not regard themselves as stigmatized nor are they so regarded by the mainstream Western population [10]. Covert colonization of nonwhite people implies the ability of colonial-descended groups to otherwise impose their ideals, omitting consideration for reactions [11]. Regardless of the particular methods used, colonial-descended groups may then construct a social environment extended from self-prescriptions. Furthermore, aside from the more obvious aggressive tactics, true colonization may derive from influential behavior and relative status. In the West, dominant groups have always been in a position to impose their ideals upon the dominated, who have been stigmatized as alien to their skin color norm [12]. As individuals, Americans may act out covert colonization of nonwhites in particular, without ever making conscious or overt decisions to do so. The willingness of nonwhites to acquiesce is rooted in their having been socialized to pursue the "American Dream." Pertaining to the dynamics of this scenario, research suggests dominant groups acquire power directly by emphasizing competence and action. Covertly colonized groups acquire power by virtue of identification with and/or submission to Western group ideals, an example being the marriage of conservative Republican Senator Phil Gramm to Asian-American Wendy Lee Gramm [13]. Given the status differential, resulting interactions between nonwhites and Western citizens of colonial descent are thus tantamount to institutionalized servitude.

Consequent to covert colonization, nonwhites who relocate to the Americas and who intermarry will have biracial offspring, a group with which many Americans may have had little or no experience. Although the literature acknowledges the existence of a Eurasian population, there has been minimal discussion of the significant differences and similarities indicative of biracial Americans and how these differences and similarities might impact the identity of the nonwhite population. Instead, discussions regarding biracial Eurasians in the West tend to incorporate them into Asian or white groups on the basis of skin color and other racial criteria that render them invisible. In the aftermath, social scientists ask the following questions: (a) First, in what ways are Eurasians diverse, and in what ways are they similar? (b) Second, what are the implications for culturally and racially diverse populations to be perceived as members of an alien group based upon skin color and other racial attributes?

Modern-day standardization of the authoritarian personality exists today, in this prehistoric glacial aftermath and colonization of the nonwhite world attributed to skin color. The authoritarian personality is a mainstay of victim-group discrimination perpetrated by people of color. Victim-group discrimination is a prerequisite to victimism by which Westerners maintain colonial control and domination of what is perceived as a glacial human environment.

The sensitive nature of discrimination has discouraged scientists from an investigation of that acted out by people of color. In particular, the role of mulattoes—biracial, light-skinned blacks who took part in slavery during the antebellum—has intimidated most scholars from study and pursuit of the facts. For all intents and purposes, discrimination is no less insidious on the basis of skin color or racial heritage. Arguably, those biracial antebellum mulattoes who took part in the antebellum slave trade are significantly more culpable than were their white counterparts in the social and biological associations they may have had with those they enslaved. Any attempts to justify black ownership of slaves as beneficial to the slave or their family is disingenuous. To then investigate discrimination absent the role of participating biracial blacks is tantamount to a mockery of objective social science.

Contrary to modern beliefs and stereotypes, discrimination is thus no longer peculiar to the white community, but is much more extensive and complex as a result of power. Relative to authority within human social structures, power is acted out by those in control, in contrast to those who are the subjects of power. According to Robert F. Bales [14], the enacting of power exists in deference to two primary forms of authority: (a) authority as an instrumental form where subjects are required to assist in the achievement of some group goal or (b) subject authority that occurs in the reinforcement of group unity and harmony relative to in-group membership. To be effective in promoting discrimination throughout society, both instrumental and group unity forms are necessary with regard to those members of victim groups, being less powerful, who are willing to demean themselves.

More often than not, the two primary functions of authority vis-à-vis power are acted out by different personnel, relative to authoritarian personality in the exercise of leadership. According to Talcott Parsons and Robert F. Bales [14], the existence of such personnel and the division of roles are evident within the traditional Western nuclear family unit. The patriarch exercises instrumental authority while the matriarch provides group unity via warmth, comfort, and so forth. Evidence of this among Western families establishes its relevancy to humankind, and is not identified with any one racial, ethnic, or religious persuasion.

In addition to its different manifestations, authority can be realized through a variety of methods. In their classic mid-twentieth-century work, Lewin, Lippit, and White address authority as being domination associated with leadership. They exposed youths to three forms of leadership: authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire. They then observed the impact of the leadership styles on the subject membership behavior [15]. The results revealed a number of differentiations. Under the authoritarian style, the leader is the sole determinant of group activity, such as policy and the designation of specific tasks. Under the democratic style, policy and specific tasks are determined by group discussion, which include participation by the leader. Lastly, under the laissez-faire style, the subjects are in complete control, assisted by a very minimal input from the leader. What is more, the way in which leaders praise and criticize the youthful male subjects differs by style as well. In reference to authoritarian leaders, group criticisms are personal. Those exposed to democratic leaders experience an environment of fairness and objectivity. In

contrast to the laissez-faire group, leaders comment little and otherwise leave group regulation totally to the subject male youth.

In the aftermath of these differing leadership styles, according to Marvin Shaw [16], subjects experience 30 times more hostility in the authoritarian group, necessary for discrimination, than in the democratic group, including eight times more aggression. Additionally, under authoritarian leadership, subject membership participate in significant levels of scapegoating, where others were assigned blame—as in racism, sexism, homophobia, anti-immigrant, anti-biracial, and so forth. Those exposed to democratic leaders appreciate them more than those exposed to authoritarian leaders, by 19 of 20 boys. Additionally, 7 of 10 boys prefer the laissez-faire leaders to the authoritarian style. While no appreciable difference in in-group productivity exists, apparently the products of the democratic leadership style appear of better quality than of other groups.

Relative to leadership is the manner in which leaders emerge from the membership [17]. According to George C. Homans [17], group leaders are generally those who manifest something unique and are accorded a special status by group members. In addition, other investigators contend that leaders consist of persons who play a major role in the activities of the group [18]. Subsequently, leaders may be predisposed to lead and followers predisposed to follow. Thus, the most critical element of group behavior is a matter of person-centered behavior versus circumstances requiring action.

Following World War II, sociologists at the University of California-Berkeley investigated the notion of a person-centered hypothesis to determine its significance. They concluded that there is a specific personality type that is predisposed to rigidity and group hierarchical authority, hence the authoritarian personality. The essence of their psychology is descended from the authoritarian dichotomous paradigm necessary for discrimination. The result is a subject inclined to blind obedience and submission to domination in committing discriminatory acts against less powerful, nonwhite populations [19]. To illustrate this, investigators gathered empirical evidence from American respondents using clinical interviews and attitude tests. What they consistently found was the tendency of some respondents toward obedience, which they again defined as authoritarian personalities. Relative to the authoritarian dichotomous paradigm, in-group authoritarian personalities are prone to discriminate against nonwhite Americans and also maintain specific sentiments regarding authority. These sentiments include submission to those in power, harshness to those they regard as powerless, and a pronounced belief in the significance of power and domination of others. The authoritarian personality is associated with a consistent agreement with such statements on the attitude scales as, “Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn”; “Most of our social problems would be solved if we could somehow get rid of the immoral, the crooked and feeble-minded people”; and “People can be divided into two distinct classes: [i.e.: dichotomous] the weak and the strong” [19].

The University of California-Berkeley researchers further contend that this attitudinal pattern is a demonstration of subliminal personality traits subjects may form during childhood. Subsequently, respondents who score high on minority prejudice

and authoritarianism also depict their childhood as being dominated by a rigid, all-powerful father figure who demands absolute obedience. In a Freudian manner, children dominated to such an extent have few options other than to suppress or negate any hostility toward their power superior father. They cannot afford the mere acknowledgment of such hostility, necessitating that its existence be forced from consciousness. They develop what psychoanalysts describe as a “reaction formation” [20]. That is, as the powerless victims of their all-powerful father’s domination, they adopt the inverse response by becoming totally obedient as a matter of justifiable virtue. However, their hostile feelings are not diminished completely, but instead are redirected at less formidable victims including nonwhites, women, gays, lesbians, biracial Americans, immigrants, or other less powerful out-groups. To sustain this redirection of hostility, they place high value on “toughness” and an equally valued “taboo on weakness.” Thus, the hostility these respondents could not acknowledge within themselves is redirected as existing externally in others. In Freudian terms, they displayed another defense mechanism called “projection,” where the ego expels any personal attributes it cannot assimilate into its ideal personality structure [20]. Using such logic, any victim group is perceived by whites prone to aggression and environmental domination as being hordes of destructive barbarians who would annihilate peaceful and/or weaker populations if given the chance. Thus, in Western parlance, victim out-groups including people of color, biracial persons, gays, lesbians, women, and immigrants require control by subjugation to the power of white authority and, if necessary, violence. The status of the aforementioned victim-group populations, comparative to colonial power and authority, is similar to domination by a rigid all-powerful father, which predisposes the culprit to discrimination.

Compared to principles of the authoritarian dichotomous paradigm, classical definitions of authoritarianism emphasize the rejection of victim groups. In the West, in today’s predominantly Judeo-Christian environment, victim groups include more than traditional nonwhite populations [5]. Recently, this particular form of group psychology manifested an emphasis on absolute devotion to the dominant-group population in response to what it perceives as environmental aggression. This reaction further contributes to societal discrimination, where the risk of harm is not only ignored but may be an integral part of a strategy. As a result, Americans are convinced that discrimination against nonwhites will enable their valued exercise of power and domination over the environment and the defeat of alien nonwhite forces. Both the membership and the leadership of such groups are then characterized as indicative of the authoritarian personality. Continuing evidence of white supremacy suggests that the human environment is dominated by such a personality, no longer exclusive of victim-group populations. Western domination of victim-group populations has resulted in the environmental standardization of racial and other forms of discrimination. It is this environmental influence, referred to as ecology, that is the last step in the eventuality of today’s victimism form of discrimination, enacted by victim-group populations.

Succinctly put, ecology is a branch of science that investigates the relationship between organisms and their environments [21]. Extended from ecology is the

perspective utilized as a construct for integrating theories of human behavior [22]. This construct is tantamount to a metaphor enabling the organization of people and their environments into a common entity where one is defined in context of its relationship to the other. That relationship is differentiated by reciprocity, in which people and their environments constantly manipulate, define, and occasionally alter one another to make the relationship a transactional phenomenon.

Reciprocity is a significant aspect of the transactional phenomenon, where the human organism produces momentous changes over time. In contrast to linear cause-and-effect relationship phenomena, the environment in transactional phenomena is altered as a consequence of changes in the organism [23]. Thus, through transactional phenomena, both entities are impacted, making for a circular exchange. The occurrence of any major event will then commence at one point and influence at another circuitously between the organism and its environment [24]. This unprecedented view of human behavior determines how it is structured, analyzed, and perceived. In the aftermath are found more effective strategies for meeting personal needs in manners consistent with values, ethics, and principles of defining—in this case—a Western entity. Thus, as a result of the ecological perspective, victim-group populations succumb to bio-psycho-social problems in the occurrence of victimism as their own version of racism and/or discrimination.

Assessment of bio-psycho-social problems is enhanced by utilization of the ecological perspective. The “bio” takes into consideration the implications of genetic endowment, such as race and skin color, for the function or dysfunction of human organisms that contribute to quality of life. The “psycho” takes into consideration the implications of psychological endowment, such as covert colonization, in the adaptive strategies extended from environmental demands contributing to the same [25]. Finally, the “social” involves an ability to carry out roles in relation to other members of the group, community, and/or society at large, such as subjugation of victim-group populations, in a manner consistent with the aforementioned [26].

Adaptation is a concept germane to the bio-psycho-social apparatus of an organism. Adaptation is frequently confused with adjustment, but in fact is distinguishable in that adjustment refers to a passive effort to accommodate the environment [27]. Pathological consequences are all but irrelevant in the context of adjustment. Conversely, adaptation contains a therapeutic dimension and is proactive, that is, relative to adaptation, human organisms attempt to engage “goodness-of-fit” between person and environment for the fulfillment of needs, aspirations, and other quality-of-life conditions. Should fit be ill suited or should the environment change, per adaptation, human organisms will actively attempt change in themselves, the environment, or both, including the organism’s internal and/or external dimensions. Thus, unlike adjustments via the ecological perspective, adaptation accommodates the preferred needs and objectives of the human organism relative to its bio-psycho-social environment [28].

The pro-activity of adaptation should not imply that passivity is totally irrelevant. From the ecological perspective, human organisms may actively choose to be passive in certain extreme situations. When this occurs in an adaptational context, the critical dynamic is psycho-system control in making the decision to be

passive. Furthermore, passivity in the context of adaptation may involve manipulation of the environment as in geographic relocation, group association, and so forth [29]. Accordingly, in the effort of the organism to obtain goodness-of-fit, passivity may enable movement toward or from pathological circumstances. Hence, adaptation occurs whether the movement is by active confrontation or passive avoidance. The specific aspects of such adaptive movements are fashioned by the bio-psycho-social styles endemic to groups at various stages of existence, reflected in what they think of themselves. The incidence of discrimination among victim-group populations exists because victim groups think less of themselves, having evolved in an environment dominated by authoritarian, Western bio-psycho-social ideals to which few have been held accountable.

Some in the American mainstream would probably be astonished to know that victim groups, including people of color, would discriminate against one another on the basis of having light skin color. Their having evolved under an authoritarian ecology relative to bio-psycho-social function should otherwise dispel confusion. The time and effort invested by all to do away with discrimination might somehow make victim groups appear less given to practices against which they have rallied constantly. However, the idealization of light skin is a postcolonial bio-psycho-social issue that is deeply rooted and complex. It is so institutionalized throughout the world through Western influence that it is widely accepted that any victim of discrimination is prone to impose such idealization upon other victim groups as well. To some extent, those who immigrate and settle in the West give in to the perpetration of discrimination once they arrive, regardless of their previous cultural experience or skin color.

For victim-group populations, the idealization of light skin has a long and established history. Contributing to their ignorance is the fact that for decades Europe has been portrayed as the ultimate human ideal. Proximity to European traits has become a psychosocial objective of victims, which facilitates discrimination against those with dark skin and nonwhite racial features. There should be no doubt as to the accuracy of this assumption. Notwithstanding, to then characterize discrimination in a narrow white context is tantamount to escaping from reality. It enables the otherwise absurd rhetoric that only white Americans or persons of European descent are capable of discrimination in a modern world that has elected a black man as president of the United States. Analyzing the role of victim groups in acts of discrimination is a necessity. Hence, and never previously suggested, it is imperative to investigate discrimination as acted out by people of color, women, gays, lesbians, biracial Americans, and immigrants. While it is no doubt politically incorrect to cite victims of discrimination or stray from the white perpetrator model, avoidance would be tantamount to fraud. The role of victim groups in the perpetuation of worldwide discrimination is one of the unspoken dynamics of the process in this postcolonial era. The fact of less attention to victim-group discrimination is not irrelevant to the aggressive suppression of nonwhite ideas, referred to in the modern era as Eurocentrism.

Eurocentrism is defined herein as a Western worldview of the human universal social environment. It is an intellectual extension of prehistoric Caucasian

aggression, where domination of the environment was perceived as a necessity for survival. Eurocentrism is the reason for the Western discrimination model and the inability of scholars to acknowledge discrimination perpetrated by victim-group populations. Although victim groups such as people of color have acknowledged skin color discrimination back to the antebellum era, the narrow Western perspective of the human social universe has rendered it all but nonexistent.

Eurocentrism is a prehistoric paradigm that has prevailed into the modern era and has impacted the professoriate throughout American history [30]. It is the foundation for both eugenics and the white supremacist, intelligence theories of Herrnstein and Murray. This otherwise obvious assumption has not been subject to challenge in the least. Western academia is no doubt a recapitulation of the prehistoric glacial experience that has spurred the current world order. Furthermore, despite the globalization of knowledge, higher education remains a bastion of Eurocentric operatives [31].

Thus, commensurate with these operatives, higher education evolved in correlation to Eurocentric problems, Eurocentric theories, Eurocentric perspectives, and Eurocentrically appointed intellectual icons. Hence, it was virtually inevitable that the incidents of victim-group discrimination, despite being well known among victim groups themselves, would go virtually unnoticed by otherwise learned scholars. That inevitability reflects constraints upon nonwhite intellectuals and the resulting trivialization of their perspectives.

In the aftermath, higher education and scholarship in general have become a marketing outlet of Eurocentric perspectives and experiences [32]. This pronounced contradiction between the ethos of academia and the experiences of an increasingly diverse student population mandates profound challenges to its current structure and ideological configuration. In order to remain viable, the Western professoriate must accommodate flexibility in thought to facilitate emerging trends in population shifts. The inability to do so will encourage accusations of propaganda from the various tools of propaganda it proposes to confront [33]. The implication of this bias is that scientific investigation will convert to a myopic state, in both shape and substance. Scientific objectivity will then lend itself accordingly to Eurocentric standards of fact at the expense of the universal human social and intellectual environment [34].

In this millennial moment of endings, not only are the implications of victim-group discrimination being bandied about but, indeed, the entire world is poised for universal transformation. In this new era, an official end to discrimination in all of its various manifestations is a potent human possibility. Antiquated notions of race as a biological concept are becoming extinct with alarming rapidity. The ceaseless exploitation of social and political polarization has rendered race as little more than a gigantic storehouse of raw emotion, destined for the archives of both real and imaginary colonial political objectives. With this understanding, it is now possible for all of humankind to begin the work of rewriting and redefining the universal human social environment. The antiquated notion of defining discrimination by white perpetrators and black victims has come to an end in the sense that miscegenation in the new millennium will continue increasingly to be the norm. That fact is apparent, given that the relationship between phenotype and so-called race

is changing drastically for Eurasians, Afro-Asians, and genetic heritage in general. It is an interesting social evolution between the emerging importance of the non-white perspective and the waning intellectual dominance of Eurocentrism. This new dynamic has caused the world's peoples to be engaged in an unprecedented era of intellectual evolution. They are, in fact, the agents of intellectual evolution. Social science, presently Eurocentrically organized, is losing its ability to assess this evolution, being obliged to serve, instead, the whims of a Western intellectual power structure that is driven by prehistoric intellectual forces it cannot acknowledge nor fully comprehend and which are not irrelevant to victim-group people of color.

Mexico is America's most immediate, southern, victim-group neighbor. Its past president, Vicente Fox (Vicente Fox Quesada), is a primary example of the Eurocentric mentality visited upon victim-group populations that have been dominated psychologically by colonial ideals. While the circumstances of Fox's anglicized name are subject to challenge, the change from Zorro to Fox is readily apparent. Like many other members of colonized victim-group populations, he has taken part in the public display of black denigration. While defending illegal Mexican immigrants, according to reports, he told white participants in a Texas business meeting that "illegal aliens are doing the jobs that even blacks in the U.S. won't do" [35]. Such a statement is not an intended slight upon the black community. Descended from a Eurocentrically colonized population, Fox merely manifests a form of victim-group discrimination no less apparent among other similarly dominated victim-group peoples [35].

This millennium will witness a radical reorientation of victim-group populations in the increasing miscegenation of intellectual discourse. The intellectual traditions of Eurocentrism will continue to decline until it is defunct. Accordingly, a new concept of scientific investigation will emerge, one in which a narrow view of discrimination will be less and less significant. Thus, the assumption that discrimination is contingent upon white perpetration will be diminished as an obstacle to scientific objectivity. The end of white discrimination as the sole manifestation is evident in the growth of discrimination litigation brought on the basis of skin color by victim-group people of color in US District Courts, such as *Walker v the IRS*. Furthermore, the influence of skin color is validated by various skin color studies that have been conducted by scholars who are sensitive to current trends. The scientific method also forces Western society to correct itself. It raises the possibility of realistically and permanently changing the prescripts of discrimination. Undoubtedly, if it can be done, it will be done.

Thus, the end of the twentieth century is actually the beginning of a new era in the perception of discrimination in the West and the world at large. Not long ago, the West had little idea of how radically its fundamental ideas about racism and discrimination would be overturned. In fact, given the new velocity of nonwhite scholarship, it is logical to expect changes to be proportionately radical. It goes without saying that such expectation is mere speculation. However, at a critical point in history, this new millennium offers a basis for such speculation. It can be rationalized in the utilization of two criteria that will manifest as megatrends (general shifts in thinking or approach affecting countries, industries, and organizations) [36]: skin color miscegenation and intellectual miscegenation.

Heretofore, skin color miscegenation has been the primary megatrend. It would appear illogical on the surface, but this is because the first and most fundamental objective of a group, racial or otherwise, is to conserve its own being. That notion extends to the cultural mindset of all world populations. It cannot be stated with any degree of certainty just how strong a drive it is. Notwithstanding, perhaps the fundamental idealizations of light skin are not written in stone, but they are habits that may be broken, in the spasms of intellectual debate, and then transcended. Accordingly, past notions about light skin have defined discrimination, leading to pseudoscientific conclusions extended from a lapse in scholarly rigor. However, legitimate science and biology, in fact, would suggest otherwise. Taken in a biological context, the freedom to engage in skin color miscegenation is a megatrend that is justifiable on moral grounds. The antebellum assumption of colonialists illuminates the point of how far power structures, with their collective obsessions, are prepared to go to dominate the mass mindset, by presuming to affect the universal characteristics of human reality.

The idea that no one color group will actually dominate is among the most radical changes in this new millennium—indeed, the ideal of light skin color will cease to exist. Scholarship will be less given to political solvency and more to the dictates of a multi-intellectual perspective. Similarly, in the world there will be less intellectual homogeneity and Western intellectual domination. This fact no doubt will extend to the attitudes and respect for multiracial and multicultural ways of thinking. However, the idealization of a nonwhite multi-intellectual perspective in some form may not, unfortunately, dominate but will still survive. Those who celebrate the new millennium will continue to be discontented over past and present injustices upon victim-group populations by the practices of discriminatory behaviors. Even so, the new millennium promises a trend toward total rebirth and worldwide regeneration. It will continue to be cultivated in the intellectual seeds that will be sown by victim-group scholars and how they scrutinize discrimination and other narrowly defined social phenomena.

The questions thus remain as to what lies ahead amid the end of Western Eurocentrism as the intellectual ideal. To what could history be pointing with its ruthless discarding of such a sacred Western concept? A clue may rest in the end of the tyranny of a Western perspective as the standard ideal. Science has already seen technology end the tyranny of repetitive labor. In that time, the West has led the world in charting the course of mankind in a new direction. Along the course of this new direction will come the human effort to reorganize social life, to reinvent the family, and to liberate victim groups from the tyranny of their universal denigration. Enabled by their conscious and active intervention, the ideals of Eurocentrism that are central to defining discrimination will be compromised in order to facilitate the civil evolution of mankind well into the new millennium.

References

1. Herrnstein, R., & Murray, C. (1994). *The bell curve*. New York: Free Press.
2. Beatty, B. (2009). The bell curve. (Revised article) [Human Intelligence online]. <http://www.indiana.edu/intell/bellcurve.shtml>. Accessed 26 June 2009.

3. Bradley, M. (1978). *The iceman inheritance*. Toronto: Dorset.
4. Welsing, F. (1970). *The Cress theory of color confrontation and racism*. Washington, DC: C-R Publishers.
5. Kitano, H. (1985). *Race relations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
6. Powell, A. (1997). Through my grandfather's eyes: ties that bind. Paper presented at the 1997 National Conference of African American Studies and Hispanic and Latino Studies, Houston, Texas.
7. Pratt, J. (1950). *America's colonial experiment*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
8. Hall, R. (2003). *Discrimination among oppressed populations*. Lewiston, NY: Mellen.
9. Hyde, C. (1995). The meanings of whiteness. *Qualitative Sociology*, 18(1), 87–95.
10. Cooley, C. (1902). *Human nature and the social order*. New York: Schreiber.
11. Chan, S. (1991). *Asian Americans: an interpretive history*. Boston: Twayne.
12. Hedley, M. (1994). The presentation of gendered conflict in popular movies: affective stereotypes, cultural sentiments, and men's motivation. *Sex Roles*, 31, 721–740.
13. Hoetink, H. (1967). *The two variants in Caribbean race relations: A contribution to the sociology of segmented societies*. (E. M. Hookykas, Trans.) London: Oxford University Press.
14. Bales, R. (1951). *Interaction process analysis: a method for the study of small groups*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
15. Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., and White, R. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10, 271–299.
16. Shaw, M. (1976). The psychology of small groups. *Experimental Social Psychology*, 1, 111–147.
17. Homans, G. (1974). *Elementary forms of social behavior*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
18. Crosbie, P. (1975). *Interaction in small groups*. New York: Macmillan.
19. Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Norton & Co.
20. Gleitman, H. (1986). *Psychology*. New York: Norton & Company.
21. Kailash, (1997). Human ecological stress and demographic decline: a case of Negritos of Andamans. *Indian Journal of Social Work*, 58(3), 382–402.
22. Teall, B. (2000). Using solution-oriented interventions in an ecological frame: a case illustration. *Social Work in Education*, 22(1), 54–61.
23. Smith, S. (1999). "Now that mom is the Lord's arms, I just have to live the way she taught me": reflections on an elderly, African American mother's death. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*, 32(2), 41–51.
24. Jory, B., & Anderson, D. (1999). Intimate justice II: fostering mutuality, reciprocity, and accommodation in therapy for psychological abuse. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 25(3), 349–364.
25. Beverly, C. (1989). Treatment issues for black, alcoholic clients. *Social Casework*, 70(6), 370–374.
26. Green, R., & Ephross, P. (1991). *Human behavior theory and social work practice*. New York: DeGruyter.
27. Mackey, R., & O'Brien, B. (1999). Adaptation in lasting marriages. *Families in Society*, 80(6), 587–596.
28. Schwartz, A. (1999). Americanization and cultural preservation in Seattle's Settlement House: a Jewish adaptation to the Anglo-American model of settlement work. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 26(3), 25–47.
29. Erwin, E., & Kipness, N. (1997). Fostering democratic values in inclusive early childhood settings. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 25(1), 57–60.
30. Monteiro, A. (2000). Being an African in the world: the Du Boisian epistemology. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 568, 220–234.

31. Iida, K. (2000). Globalization and human rights: conversion of intellectual paradigm(m). *Japanese Journal of Social Services*, 2, 87–100.
32. Holton, R. (2000). Globalization's cultural consequences. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 570, 140–152.
33. Barak, M. (2000). The inclusive workplace: an ecosystems approach to diversity management. *Social Work*, 45(4), 339–352.
34. Park, S., & Green, C. (2000). Is transracial adoption in the best interest of ethnic minority children?: questions concerning legal and scientific interpretations of a child's best interests. *Adoption Quarterly*, 3(4), 5–34.
35. Digger [pseud.](2009). Vicente Fox: illegal aliens 'doing jobs that not even blacks want to do.' <http://www.diggersrealm.com/mt/archives/001031.html>. Accessed 14 June 2009.
36. Naisbitt, J. (1982) *Megatrends: ten new directions transforming our lives*. New York: Warner Books.

Index

Note: The letter 't' following the locators refer to tables.

A

"A.B.C.," (America's Blackest Child), 50

Accented speech, Latinos, 76–77

Activism

gay and lesbian, 129

to institutional racism, 149

Red-black Cuffee, forms of, 37, 98

woman's, 145–148

Adaptation, pathological consequences/pro-activity of, 193–194

Addams, J., 148

African-American populations, 109

political organizations, leading roles
in, 118

African-Americans

account of William Ellison, largest owner
of black slaves, 44–46

belief systems in nontotalitarian society, 40

"black is beautiful" movement, 50

Charleston, South Carolina, 43

1964 Civil Rights act, 48

confusion at slave auctions, 41

EEOC, 52

female slaves, 41

'hegemony,' 40

"house Negroes," 41

"human interactions" (Pierce), 38

Justice Clarence Thomas, 49–52

mulattos, 38

oppressor–oppressed dichotomy, 38

1960s healthier norms, 48

slave breeding, 45

slavery, 42–43

Southern white belief system, 39

"sugar-coated form of slavery," 51

"uppity blacks," 46

African ancestry, features, 109

Afro-Canadians, 105

Afro-Nicaraguans, 73, 168

Agatharchides, 2

Alabama train incident (1930), 31

Alloeei-Cofie, 159

Allport, G., 2, 28

Allstons, 117

The Almost White Boy (Motley, W.), 121

Al Sharpton, 69

An American Dilemma, 39–40

American Dream, 8, 62, 76, 167, 170, 189

American Puritanical tradition, 185

American Revolution, 117

An American Dilemma, Myrdal, 120

Anderson, Martin Lee (2006), case study, 134

Anderson, M. L., 134

Andrews, R. N., 45

Angel, J., 42

Anglo-Saxon values and cultural practices, 168

Animahh, C., 159

Antebellum, 5, 31, 37–42, 47, 54, 68, 74, 95,
98–100, 103, 105, 109–112, 116,
118–121, 123–125, 133, 145, 152,
162, 170, 190, 195, 197

life for biracial Americans, 109

mulatto hypothesis, 109–110

Anti-Chinese tensions, 59

Anwar Sadat (Egypt's leader), 173

Aryans, 58

Asclepiades, 3

Asian-Americans

Aryans, 58

Asian-American Eurogamy, 64

"black racism," 68

CCC, 65–67, 66t

Chinese, 59

Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, 59

Chinese, skin color discrimination in
China, 59–60

discrimination in India, 61–63

"domination model," 57

- Asian-Americans (*cont.*)
 embracing Western culture in America, 57
 Eurogamy, concept of, 64–65
 exogamy, 60
The Far Eastern Economic Review, 60
 Filipinos, 59
 Indian Asian caste system, 62
 “racial” and “nonracial” castes, 62
 Japanese, 58–59
 Koreans, 60
 Ming Dynasty, 56
 Nara period (A.D. 710–793), 59
 Pakistan, Asian women in, 64
 psychological colonization in the
 discrimination against oppressed
 victim-group, 67
Race Relations, 56
 1988 rock-throwing incident, 60
Sunshine Girls, 65
 Ying Ma and discrimination, 67–70
 Asian Exclusion Act of 1889, 7
 Assimilation theory, sexual orientation, 131
Atlanta Journal-Constitution, 174
 Attitudes of Americans towards immigrant
 population, 172t
 Attucks, C., 97–98
 Australia, largest foreign-born population, 169
 Authority/authoritarian
 leadership, 191
 manner in which leaders emerge, 191
 personality, modern-day standardization,
 189, 191
 two primary forms of, 190
 variety of methods, 190
- B**
 Baldwin, J., 40
 Baldwins, 117
 Bales, R. F., 190
 Banton, M., 24
 Bartram, W., 99
 Beals, J., 124
 Bell, A., 153
The Bell Curve, 29–30, 184
 Bell, D. A., 153
 Bennett, W., 134
 Best society, 46, 114
 Biestek, F. principles of, 161
 Bio-psycho-social problems, assessment
 of, 193
 Biracial Americans, 109–125
 advantages of white blood “house
 Negroes,” 111
 antebellum period, life during, 109
 color contradictions, 109
 one-drop theory, 109
 unadulterated dark-skinned blacks, 109
 appearance, 111
 “biracial,” 110
 as blacks, privileges, 111
 Civil War, 112
 color caste system, 112
 dual black parentage, person born of, 111
 Hume, D. (Scottish philosopher), 110
 manumission, 112
 marriages, 125
 mulatto hypothesis, 109–110
 Negro aristocracy, 115
 field Negroes, 114
 house Negroes, 111
 Oliver Goldsmith, white scholar, 110
 pseudoscientific theory, 110
 sexual exploitation, 118
 skin color description, 114
 South Carolinians practices, 115
 victim-group discrimination, genesis
 of, 109
 Who's Who in Colored America,
 (Reuter, B.), 113
 Biracial population, 14–15
 California data on, 15
 aftermath of colonization, 16
 biracial and mono-racial births, 15
 Eurasian births, 15
 reason for increase in biracial births,
 15–16
 Eurasian Filipino, 15
 “Black 400,” 46, 114
 Black community, 109, 113
 elite communities, 115
 wealthy class of, 114
 best society, 114
 black 400, 114
 colored aristocracy, 114
 upper tens, 114
*Black Confederates and Afro-Yankees in Civil
 War Virginia*, 43
Black Indians: A Hidden Heritage
 (Katz, W. L.), 94, 103
 “Black is beautiful” movement, 50
*Black Masters: A Free Family of Color in the
 Old South*, 43
 Blackness, symbolism of, 4
 “Black racism,” 68–69
 Black v. white, symbolic meaning of, 4

- "Black/white" dichotomy, 8, 24–25, 54, 102, 106, 171
 Bleaching, 14, 64, 158–161
 African bleaching girls, 159
 risk factors, 159
 Syndrome, 158
 Bonilla-Silva, E., 27
 Boots, S., 93
 Boston crime (1989), 134
 Boston Massacre, 97
 Boston's black upper tens, 117
 Boykin, A. H., 46
 Bradley, M., 5, 184–187
 Brazil, enslavement of Africans, 80–81
 See also Latino-Americans
 Breck, E., 156
 'Breck Girl,' 155–158
 "Brownin," 158–159
 "Brown paper bag test," 48
 "Brown racism," 173, 176
 "Brute"/"sambo" stereotypes (Lombardo, B.), 28–29
 Brute stereotype, 28, 147
 Buckner, J. W., 46

C
 California's Proposition 8, 141
 Carolinians (South) practices, 46, 115
 Carter, N. M., 177
 Casavantes, E., 76
 Cass, V. C., 133
 Castro, F., 26, 80–81, 179
 revolution, 26, 179
 Catlin, G., 96
 CCC, *see* Cutaneo-Chroma Correlate (CCC)
 CCC data, Latin americans, 87–89, 87t–88t
 Chang, I., 60
 Chappelles, 117
 Cherokee Nation, 91
 attitude, 94
 dusky sisters, girls, 101
 full-blooded, 92
 half-breeds, 92
 marrying well, tradition, 101
 Ojibwa tribe, 105
 red-black, 92
 refinement of daughters, 100
 schools/students, 100–101
 war, slavery, 92
 Childhood *tabula rasa* (Agatharchides), 2
 China/Chinese, 59
 racial incident in, 173
 skin color discrimination in China, 59–60
 Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, 59
 Chrysostom, D., 3
 Church Arson Prevention Act of 1996, 25
 Civil Rights Act (1964), 48, 52
 Clark, M., 84
 Clinton, 69
 Colangelo, N., 30
 Colonization
 act of European colonization, 11
 aftermath of colonization, 16
 canonization of racial discrimination, 17
 colonial implications of dark skin
 ability of victim populations, 13
 among victim-group Americans, 12
 among women, 12
 biracial offspring, 14
 identity pathology, 14
 intermarriage, people of color, 14
 paternalistic attitude toward
 the West, 14
 socially selected physical traits, 13
 somatic trait, 14
 victim version of discrimination, 12
 definition (Kitano, H.), 187
 education, impact of, 18–19
 elites, Eurocentric, 17–18
 Eurocentrism, 17
 incorporation of alternatives to race
 discrimination, 18
 reason for, 18
 melanin, value of, 11
 need for their colonial control, 11
 oppressed populations, upliftment, 17
 psychological colonization of victim
 groups, 16, 18–19
 Western geopolitical entity, 17
 Color
 caste system, 112
 -coded concept of "legitimate"/"illegitimate" birth, *see* Latino-Americans
 contradictions, 109
 designations of, 1–2
 issues in public/private venues, 105
 "Colored aristocracy," 46, 114
 "Coloreds," 27
 Cooley, C., 14
 Cordero-Guzman, H., 71
Costenos (persons of African descent), 26
 Covert colonization, people of color,
 188–189, 193
 color-based hierarchy, exhibit, 188
 symbols of status, 188

Creoles, black persons of European descent, 73–74, 168
 Cress Theory of Color Confrontation and Racism, 185–186
 Criminalized sexualization, 138
 Cross, W., 14
 Crow, J., 122
 Cuban immigration, 179
 Cuffee, P., 98
 Cutaneo-Chroma Correlate (CCC), 65–67, 66t, 87t–88t, 157

D

Dark skin
 colonial implications of
 ability of victim populations, 13
 among victim-group Americans, 12
 among women, 12
 biracial offspring, 14
 identity pathology, 14
 intermarriage, people of color, 14
 paternalistic attitude toward the West, 14
 socially selected physical traits, 13
 somatic trait, 14
 victim version of discrimination, 12
 See also Colonization
 common terms for, 4
 Dark skin, symbol of forbidden sexuality, 75
 Davenport Cotton, K., 177
 Davis, K., 61
 Defensive mentality among today's Western populations, 185
 DeFrancesco Soto, V. M., 177
 Deisher, R., 132
 Deloria, P. J., 103
 Dichotomy
 "black/white," 8, 24–25, 54, 102, 106, 171
 dark/light skin, 2
 oppressor–oppressed, 38
 Dietrich, D. R., 27
 Discrimination
 dynamics of, 134
 Euro-American phenomenon, 8
 formal/informal, 170
 individual and group analysis of, 105
 individual- and group-level, 9
 postcolonials and victim-group populations
 chronology of, 183
 sociological investigations of, 102
 Doe, P., 159
 "Domination model," 57
 Dominguez, V., 103

Douglass, F., 98
 Dual black parentage, person born of, 111
 Dubey, Professor M., 162
 Du Bois, W. E. B., 47, 125, 148, 155
 "Dumb black" stereotype, 29
 Duprees, 117
 Durham, P., 95
 Dusky sisters, 101

E

Eaton County Sheriff's Department, 135
 Ecology, 192–194
 Education
 compensatory educational programs, 29–30
 impact of, 18–19
 with importance of sports, 30
 IPEDS, 149
 Ivy League level of, 79
 EEOC, *see* Equal Opportunity Employment Commission (EEOC)
 EEOC, confrontations, 85
 Ego protection mechanisms, 105
 Egyptian immigrants (light-skinned), 173
 Ehrlich, H., 28
 Elites, Eurocentric, 17–18
 Ellison, R., 95
 Ellison, W. (largest owner of black slaves), 44–46
 Empiricus, S., 3
 Equal Opportunity Employment Commission (EEOC), 52, 85
 Erikson, E., 14
 Eurocentrism, 17–18, 194–197
 Eurogamy, 64–65, 124, 188
 European colonization, 11, 24, 54, 72, 167, 183
 European skin color, Eurocentric phenotypes, 156
 Exogamy, 60, 64

F

Fail-safe method, 119
 Fair Employment Practices Committee, 121
The Far Eastern Economic Review, 60
 Farrow, J., 132
 Fatalism, 76
 FBI, *see* Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)
 FBI hate crime statistics, 25, 135, 138
 Feagin, C., 83
 Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), 25
 Felero v. Stryker, 86
Felix v. Marquez, 180
 Feminism, 145, 154, 161–163
 Fernandes, F., 80
 Field Negroes, 47, 114–117

- Filipinos, 13, 27, 59–60
 Fletcher, A., 146
 Folklore
 American, 28
 colloquialisms of black
 other side/crossing/passing, 118
 Foreign immigrants, data (1996–97)
 people of color who immigrated, 169t
 percentage in each country, 169t
 who sought asylum, 169t
 Fox, V., 194–196
 Franklin, J. H., 42, 69
 Free blacks, 42–44, 112
 Freud, S., 3, 33, 192
 Fuller, N., 186
- G**
- Galliard, P. P., 46
 Garvey, M., 47–48, 98
 Gatewood, W. B., 117
 Gay and lesbian Americans, 127–142
 affirmative action years, 49, 137
 African-Americans/Latino-Americans, 128
 assimilation theory, 131
 Boston crime (1989), 134
 criminalized sexualization, 138
 discrimination against black, 129
 focus of schism, 131
 heterosexual Europeans, 127
 household income, 137t
 job placement and earnings, 131
 marriage equality, movements for, 130
 Irene Monroe, 130, 141
 median weekly income by race and year, 137t
 multiple jobholders by race, 137t
 new black, 129
 populations of, 127
 quality-of-life, 130
 racial bias, offenses, 138–139
 racial discrimination, 130
 sexual-orientation bias, offenses, 138
 social facts, 135
 society(al)
 assimilation problems, 132
 sexualization, 133
 stigmatization, 127
 Stonewall Riot, 127–128, 130
 television, advantages of, 133
 tension, of color, 131
 unemployment
 by college educated and race, 136t
 victim-group discrimination, 127
 victimism, 127
 wage growth, 137
 youth, 132
 Gay men, 129, 139–140
 Gene pool, 16, 119
 Genetic proportion, 109
 Georgia court cases (1850), 114
Ghigin, 59
 Gilman, C. P., 146
 Goldsmith, O., 110
 History of the Earth, 111
 Gordon, A., 2, 28
 Gordon, A. F., 104
 Grace, 158
 Gramm, W. L., 5–6, 189
 Gramsci, A., 102
 Grasha, K., 135
 April 2006 case, 135
 Greeks, 2–3, 111
 Green, M., 160
 Grier, M., 105
 Grimkes, 117
 Grynawski, J. D., 177
 Guidance Laboratory for Gifted and Talented
 students, 30
 Gyaamfua, D., 159
- H**
- Half-breeds, 92, 94
 Harry, H., 3
 Harvard Law School, 153
 Hate crimes by race and number of incidents, 26t
 Hate Crime Statistics Act (1990), 25
Haunting and the Sociological Imagination
 (Gordon, A. F.), 104
 Haydens, 117
 Healthier norms (1960), 48
 ‘Hegemony,’ 17–18, 39–40, 140, 183
 Herodotus, 3
 Herrnstein, R., 7, 29, 68, 138,
 184–186, 195
 Heterosexual orientation, 131–132
 See also Gay and lesbian Americans
 Hetrick, E., 133
The Hindu, matrimonial columns
 of, 61
 Hodes, M., 114
 Hoetink, H., 3, 13
 Hogue, C., 58
 Homans, G.C., 191
 Honorary whites (Asian-Americans), 27
 Hooks, B., 103

Horowitz, M., 33
 Horry, M. L., 42
 Horton, W.
 Michael Dukakis, television ads, 133
 Republican Party, 133
 House Negroes, 41, 47, 111, 114–117
 aristocrats, 116–117
 “How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?” (Harvard Educational Review), 29
 Hughes, L., 121
Human Behavior in Social Environment, 160
 “Human interactions” (Pierce), 37–38, 80, 129, 142, 170
 Hume, D., 110–111
 Hydroquinone, 160

I

The Iceman Inheritance (Bradley, M.), 184–185
 Illegal immigration, issue of, 171
 flow of illegal immigrants across the Mexican border, 172
 three strategies for addressing illegal immigrants, 171
 Immigrants
 Anglo-Saxon values and cultural practices, 168
 attitudes of Americans toward immigrant population, 172
 black/white discrimination dichotomy, 171
 “brown racism,” 173
 Chiman Rai, murder trial of Indian immigrant, 174–176
 China, racial incident in, 173
 Cuban immigration, 179
 Egyptian immigrants (light-skinned), 173
 Felix v. Marquez, 180
 foreigners, data (1996–97), 169
 formal/informal discrimination, 170
 illegal immigration, issue of, 171
 flow of illegal immigrants across Mexican border, 172
 three strategies for addressing illegal immigrants, 171
 Indian caste system, 173
 Latino immigrants and victim group discrimination, 180–181
 negative views, studies on, 177–178
 Nicaraguans, victim-group discrimination, 168
 North Carolina, increase in immigrants, 177

OECD, 168
 travel brochures for island of Puerto Rico, 173, 180
 victim group discrimination
 among immigrant people of color, 173
 among Indian-Asians, 176
 anecdotal accounts of, 179
 Latino immigrants and, 180–181
 tendency of Latino immigrants towards, 179

India(n)

Asian brand of victim group discrimination, 62
 caste system, 173
 Cleveland, 105
 color discrimination in, 61–63
 Indian Asian caste system, 62
 “racial” and “nonracial” castes, 62
 killing class, 96
 “Individualization,” 161–162
 In-group/out-group authoritarian dichotomous paradigm, 33–34
 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), 149
 Intellectual superiority as rationale for discrimination, 185–186
 Inter marriage, people of color, 15, 59, 83
 IPEDS, *see* Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS)
 IQ differences between races, 29
 Ivy League institutions, 79, 149

J

Jackson, J., 69
 Jamil, N., 64
 Japanese, 7, 27, 58–60, 63–65
 Jensen, A., 29
 Jim Crow attitude, 119, 122
 Joe E., 83
 Johnson, M. P., 43
 Jones, E. L., 95
 Jordan, Jr. E. L., 42–44
 Judeo-Christian environment, 33, 192
 Juvenile delinquency among black boys, 30

K

Katz, W. L., 94, 103
 Kendrick, J. A., 177
 Kenneth, 84
 Kerr, B. A., 30
 King Jr., M. L., 7, 98
 Kirst-Ashman, K., 160
 Kitano, H., 12, 57, 187
 Korea

- Asian-Americans, implications of light skin, 60
- sale of "darkie" toothpaste in, 70
- Kovel, J., 4
- L**
- Lackey, G. F., 177
- Lansing State Journal*, 135
- Lasater, T. M., 77
- Latino-Americans
 - accented speech, 76–77
 - Brazil, enslavement of Africans, 80–81
 - cases of discrimination litigation, 85–86
 - CCC, data, 87t–88t
 - Creoles, black persons of European descent, 73–74
 - differences between older/younger
 - Mexican Americans about dark skin, 84
 - EEOC, confrontations, 85
 - fair and just treatment from police, 77
 - Felero v. Stryker, 86
 - group complications, 85
 - influences of European cultural norm, 80
 - Latinos, 74
 - dark skin, symbol of forbidden sexuality, 75
 - lexicons for designation of skin color variation, 83
 - life among poor Latinos, 76
 - McDonnell Douglas Corporation v. Green*, 86–87
 - Mexican intermarriage, study of (Stoddard, E.), 83–84
 - Nicaraguans, 72–73
 - North America, 75
 - OCPRW, 85
 - police, 77–79
 - continuous discrimination, impact of, 79
 - Crain's New York Business*, interview by, 79
 - New Jersey incident, 78
 - treatment of Latino-American males by the American system, 79
 - Puerto Rico, skin color, 80
 - research conducted by Frederick Williams, 76–77
 - stereotypes of Latino-Americans, 76
 - type A and type B racism, 83
 - valued status of light-skinned Latinos, 82–83
- Latoya, J., 158
- Lattimores, 117
- Lesbian women, European, 129
- Lesbian Wreath*, 101
- Lew, B., 117
- Lewin, K., 190
- Lewis, R., 51
- Light-skinned mulattoes, 111, 118
 - tragic mulatto, 120
- Lippit, R., 190
- Lippmann, W., 28
- Local law enforcement institutions, 135
- Lombardo, B., 28
- Lyle, M. L., 177
- M**
- Machismo, 76
- A Man Called White*, (White, W.), 120
- Manumission, 112
- Marketing strategies, 130
- Marriage equality, gay/lesbian movements for, 130, 141–142
- Marsh, A., 2
- Marshall, T., 125
- Martin, A., 133
- Maylon, A. K., 133
- McClain, Dr. P., 177
 - studies conducted by, 177–178
- McClain, P. D., 177–179
- McDonnell Douglas Corporation v. Green*, 86–87
- McIntosh, P., 6, 155
- Meade, G., 14, 16
- Mead, G. H., 14
- Melanin, 11–12, 74, 160
- Mestizos* (racially mixed persons), 26, 74, 168
- Mexican intermarriage, study of (Stoddard, E.), 83–84
- Michigan State University, 149
- Mid-level racial status, 109, 111
- Miller, S. D., 45
- Ming Dynasty, 58
- Minority-race victim groups, 24
- Miscegenation, 27, 47, 54, 59, 73, 75, 106, 119, 123, 146, 195–197
- Mission to civilize non-Europeans, 24
- Mississippi Masala* (Nair, M.), 63
- Mixed-race
 - Americans, 15
 - biracial African-Americans, 109–110, 121
 - blacks/mulatto blacks, 112–114, 118–120, 122–124
 - Filipinos, 13
 - Latino-Americans, 71–89

Mixed-race (*cont.*)

See also Latino-Americans

light-skinned Creole descent, 42
marriages, 175

offspring, 27

See also "Coloreds"

phenotypes, 123

Monroe, I. (gay/lesbian movements), 130, 141
California's Proposition 8, 141

Moore, C., 13

Moss, T., 148

Motley, W., 121

Moynihán, D. P. (Senator), 7

Mulattoes, 38, 83, 112–113

aristocracy of culture/wealth, 115

attitude toward blacks, 113

hypothesis, 109–110, 112

aim of, 110

attitude, 118

blacks features, 111

leadership, 113

light-skinned, 111

manumission, 112

society of Charleston, 112

Southern communities, 112

whites features, 111

white males, 112

upper tens, 117

See also House Negroes

Murray, C., 29, 68, 138, 184–186, 195

Myrdal, G., 38–39, 120

N

NAACP, *see* National Association for the
Advancement of Colored People
(NAACP)

NAFTA, *see* North Atlantic Free Trade
Agreement (NAFTA)

Nagel, J., 104

Nair, M., 63

Nakasone (Prime Minister of Japan), 70

Nara period (A.D. 710–793), 59

National Association for the Advancement
of Colored People (NAACP), 47,
120–121

Native American(s), 91–106

ancestry, 109

"black/white" dichotomy, 102

characteristic features of, 91

Cherokee Nation, 91

dusky sisters, girls, 101

marrying well, tradition, 101

color issues in public/private venues, 105

ego protection mechanisms, 105

historical evidence, 91

by 1824, 93

Indian killing class, 96

invisibility of African-mixed, 103

Pan-Indianism, 103

pathology, 102

postbellum social dynamic, 103

reasons for problem, 104

red-African Americans, 96

refinement of daughters, 100

renegade, 95

slavery, 92

red-black children, 93

Shoe Boots, Native American slave
owner, 93

sociological investigations, discrimination,
102

Southern white approval, 94

urbanization, 103

Nat Turner rebellion, 116

Negro

aristocracy, 115

Suffrage, 48

The Negro Cowboys (Durham P. and
Jones, E. L.), 95

'New black,' 129–130, 138, 141

Newman, L., 146

New York City's Central Park, rape incident,
31

New York Times, 149

New York University School of Law, 153

NFL's Washington Red Skins, 105

Nicaraguans, 72–73, 168

victim-group discrimination, 168

Nightclub discrimination, 130

Nobles, W., 14

Nontotalitarian society, belief systems in, 40

Nonwhite women, 149, 152, 154–155,
160–163

North Atlantic Free Trade Agreement
(NAFTA), 177

Nunnally, S. C., 177

O

Obama, B., 141

Ober, attorney M., 134

OCPRW, *see* Office of the Commonwealth of
Puerto Rico in Washington, D.C.
(OCPRW)

Octoroons (1/8 black), 121

OECD, *see* Organization for Economic
Cooperation and Development
(OECD)

Office of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico
in Washington, D.C. (OCPRW),
85–86, 180

Ojibwa tribe, 105

Okonjo, C., 162

One-drop theory, 97–98, 103, 109, 119,
123–124

Oppong, S. M., 159

Oppressed populations, upliftment,
17, 147

Organization for Economic Cooperation and
Development (OECD), 168

Osceola, Seminole Chief, 96

P

Pakistan, Asian women in, 64

Pan-Indianism, 103

Parsons, T., 98, 190

“People of color” (Negroids and
Mongoloids), 1

Perdue, T., 98

Person-centered hypothesis, 32, 191

Pew Hispanic Center, 171

Pew Research Center for the People & the
Press, 171

Philodemus, 3

Philostratus, 3

Physical traits, socially selected,
13, 67, 188

Pierce, C. M., 37–38, 127–129, 155

“Pigmentocracy,” 26–27

Plastic surgery department, 160

Police, Latin America, 77–79

continuous discrimination, impact of, 79
Crain's New York Business, interview by,
79

fair and just treatment from, 77

New Jersey incident, 78

treatment of Latino-American males by the
American system, 79

Political campaign media (1988), 133

Poor whites, 44, 46, 115, 117

Postbellum period, 103, 105, 120, 122

Postcolonial mechanism, 16–19, 37–38, 105,
130, 136, 138, 150, 156, 170, 176,
179–180, 183–188, 194

Poussaint, A., 124

Powell, A. C., 12, 125, 187

Projection, 4–6, 33, 105, 192

Pseudoscientific theory, 17, 110, 197

Psychological colonization of victim groups,
11, 13, 16–19, 23, 67, 69

Psychological progeny, 5–6

Public schools, 7

Puerto Rico, skin color, 83, 85

Pureblood blacks, 112, 118

Q

Quadroons (1/4 black), 121

Quesada, V. F., 196

R

Rabbie, J. M., 33

Race/racial

-based romantic rituals, 130

bias, offenses, 138–139

caste system, 123

categories (Negroid, Caucasoid, and
Mongoloid), 1

discrimination, 130

canonization of, 17

incorporation of alternatives, reason for,
18

opinion/myth, 1

Race Relations, 56

“*Racial Distancing in a Southern City:*

*Latino Immigrants' Views of Black
Americans*,” 177

Racism, 139

Alabama train incident (1930), 31

Banton, Michael on racism, 24

black boys and intellectual inferiority, 30

black males as racist criminal stereotype,
31–32

black/white dichotomy, 25

“brute”/“sambo.” stereotypes

(Lombardo, B.), 28

case of Susan Smith, 32

Caucasian race domination, 25

“coloreds,” 26

Cuban- Americans, 26

education with the importance of sports, 30

‘Guidance Laboratory for Gifted and
Talented students’

institutional and systemic, 154

racism/sexism/classism/colorism/

victim-group discrimination, 35

racist stereotypes (African-American men),
28

“reaction formation,” 33

“redshirting,” 30

researches in University of California,
32–33

‘sambo’ stereotype, 28

Susan Smith, case of, 32

triracial hierarchy in US, 26

type A and type B, 83

- Racism/sexism/classism/colorism/
 victim-group discrimination, 35
- Racist stereotypes (African-American men),
 28–31, 160
- Rai, C., murder trial of Indian immigrant,
 174–176
- Rai, S. R., 174
- Ramirez, A., 77
- The Rape of Nanking*, (Iris Chang), 59
- “Reaction formation,” 4, 33, 192
- Red-African Americans, 96
- Red-black Cherokee, 92, 94
- Red-black Cuffee, 98
- “Red-haired devil,” 59
- “Redshirting,” 30
- Remafedi, G., 132
- ‘Renegade,’ 95
- Researches in University of California, 32–33
- Reuter, B., 111, 113
- Reuter, E., 41
- Richards, P. C., 43
- Ridleys, 117
- Risley, Sir H., 62, 117
- Roark, J.L., 43
- Rock-throwing incident (1988), 60
- Rodriguez, C., 71
- Rodriguez, R., 77
- Roosevelt, T., 99
- Ruffins, 117
- S**
- Sadat, A., 173
- “Sambo” stereotypes, 28–29
- Schism, focus of, 131
- Scott, J., 174
- Scotto, T. J., 177
- ‘Self,’ definition, 162–163
- Sexual exploitation, 41, 75, 118, 146
- Sexual orientation, 127–133, 135, 138–139,
 141
 assimilation theory, 131
 job placement and earnings, 131
 offenses, 138
 See also Gay and lesbian Americans
- Shaw, M., 191
- Shaw, S., 58
- Sheldon, C., 156
- Shiroi* (“white” in Japanese), 59
- Simon, C. (hockey player), 105
- Skin color
 China, discrimination in, 59–60
 description, 114
 discrimination in America
 common terms for dark skin, 4
 designations of color, 1–2
 discrimination portrayed as a
 Euro-American phenomenon, 8
 dominated victim groups, 5
 Greeks, reference from, 2–3
 Herodotus, 3
 individual and group-level discrimina-
 tion, 9
 “people of color” (Negroids and
 Mongoloids), 1
 Philodemus, 3
 projection, 4
 psychological progeny, 5
 race categories (Negroid, Caucasoid,
 and Mongoloid), 1
 race, opinion/myth, 1
 “somatic norm image,” concept of
 (Hoetink, H.), 3
 symbolic meaning of black v. white, 4
 symbolism of blackness, 4
 system of stratification, overlapped with
 skin color, 6
 Theocritus on Bombyca, 3
 victim-group discrimination, 6
 victimism for victim-group
 populations, 3
 victim-race groups, 7
 Western civilization, annals of, 1
 “white privilege,” 6
 significance of, 161
 taboo nature of, 105
- Skin color, lack of (Caucasoids), 1
- Slavery and the Evolution of Cherokee Society*
 (Perdue, T), 98
- Slaves/slavery, 42–43, 92, 109
 auctions, confusion at, 41
 breeding, 45
 Cherokee war, North Carolina, 92
 female, 41
 red-black children, 93
 Shoe Boots, Native American slave
 owner, 93
- Smith, S., case of, 32
- Social Service Review and Social Work*, 160
- Social Work Abstracts* database, 160
- Society(al)
 assimilation problems, 132
 sexualization, 133
- Socioeconomic status (SES), 29, 62, 73, 78,
 81–83
- “Somatic norm image,” concept of
 (Hoetink, H.), 3, 13

Southern white belief system, 39
 Steele, S., 50
 Stereotypes
 associated with jobs/housing/welfare
 benefits, 171
 “brute”/ “sambo”(Lombardo, B.), 28–29
 dark-skinned people, 34
 dominant-group, 68, 79
 See also Latino-Americans
 “dumb black,” 29
 historical and modern-day, 27
 in-group, 28
 Latino-Americans, 76–77
 negative, 76–77, 127, 177
 racist, 28–31, 77, 160
 use of, 13
 white, 113
 Stigmatization, 102, 127, 188
 Stoddard, E., 83
 Stonewall Riot (Greenwich Village), 127–128,
 130
 Stuart, C., 134
 “Sugar-coated form of slavery,” 51
 Sullivan, L., 54
 Sung, B. L., 64
Sunshine Girls, 65
 System of stratification, overlapped with skin
 color, 6

T

Talty, S., 41, 118
 Tat, H., 138–140
 Television, advantages of, 133
 Tenisan, R., 124
 Theocritus, 3
 Third World, 11, 23–24, 72, 167,
 170–171, 176
 Thomas, C., Justice, 49–52
 Tragic mulatto, 120–122, 124
 Travel brochures for island of Puerto
 Rico, 180
 Triracial hierarchy in US, 26
 Trotters, 117
 Turner, N., 116

U

Unadulterated dark-skinned blacks, 109–110,
 112–113, 124
 Upper tens, 46, 114, 117
 Uppity blacks, 46, 115
 See also Poor whites
*U.S. Department of Health and Human
 Services Report of the Secretary's
 Task Force on Youth Suicide*, 132

V

Van den Berghe, P. L., 89
 Victim group discrimination, 6, 127, 148
 against dark skinned African-Americans,
 129
 genesis of, 109
 and immigration
 among immigrant people of color, 173
 among Indian-Asians, 176
 anecdotal accounts of, 179
 tendency of Latino immigrants towards,
 179
 See also Immigrants
 Latino(s) immigrants, 180–181
 mulatto hypothesis, 112
 psychological colonization of groups, 16,
 18–19
 radical reorientation of population, 196
 Victimism, 3, 37, 54, 57, 64, 79, 91, 93,
 101–102, 106, 110, 125, 127,
 132–133, 147–148, 162, 176, 179,
 183–184, 186, 189, 192–193

W

Walker, A., 162
 Walker, M., 48
 Walker, T., 51
Walker v the IRS, 196
 Walters, Dr. R., 178
 studies by, 178–179
 Warren, B., 174
 Washington, B. T. (bourgeois leader), 148
 Washington, D., 63
 Washington, R. E., 173, 176
 Wayne, J., 97
 Weber, M., 12
 Wells, I. B., 146
 Welsing, Dr. F. C., 5, 40, 186–187
 Western civilization, annals of, 1–3, 19, 25,
 33–34, 61, 71, 75, 183
 Western geopolitical entity, 17, 156
 Western Roman law, 11, 80
 White attractiveness ideals, 129–130, 139
 “White privilege,” 6, 154–155, 161
 “White Protestant women,” 146
 White super-culture mechanism, 130, 162–163
 White supremacy, 3, 5–6, 44, 47, 72, 74,
 81, 109–111, 125, 131, 142, 145,
 149–150, 168, 184–187, 192
 White university committees, 151–153
 White, W., 120–121
 Whitney, R., 157
Who's Passing for White (Hughes, L.), 121

- Who's Who in Colored America*, Byron Reuter (1918), 113
- Williams, F., 76
- Williams, R., 156
- WKKK, *see* Women's Ku Klux Klan (WKKK)
- Womanism, 162–163
- Chikwenye Okonjo, 162
 - Dubey, Madhu (Professor), 162
 - gender discrimination, 163
 - white feminism, 163
- Women, 145–163
- academia, institutions, 155
 - acts of violence, 146
 - Addams, J. (social work leader)
 - criticism/victim-group discrimination, 148
 - black folk, 147
 - 'Breck Girl,' 155–158
 - carcinogen or cancer agent, 160
 - community activists, 146
 - eczema and skin ulcer, 159
 - "eternal supremacy of white race," 145
 - Fletcher, A. (anthropologist), 146
 - geopolitical tradition, 156
 - Gilman, C. P. (white women), 146
 - Grace, Canadian woman of color, 158
 - individual racism, 154
 - institutional and systemic racism, 154
 - law-abiding white community, 146
 - light/dark/"medium skin color, 158
 - lynch mobs, 147
 - nonwhite women, 149, 161
 - null hypothesis, 158
 - Pierce/Du Bois, non white scholars, 155
 - political or financial issues, 153
 - public institutions, 150–152
 - full-time faculty 2003, 152t
 - full-time female faculty, 150t
 - full-time nonwhite faculty, 151t
 - racial/skin color discrimination, 150
 - racist system of subjugation, 154
 - significances of skin color, 161
 - skin diseases, 161
 - steroids, lethal combination, 159
 - Washington, B. T. (bourgeois leaders), 148
 - womanism, 162
- Women's Ku Klux Klan (WKKK), 145–146
- Woodson, C. G., 95
- A Wreath of Cherokee Rose Buds*, 101
- Y**
- Ying Ma, 67–70
- Z**
- Zaheer, Dr. N., 159
- Zarella, J., 134
- Zastrow, C., 160